MONSTROSITY AND IDENTITY IN THE COMEDIAS OF LOPE DE VEGA

Sarah Apffel Cegelski

A dissertation submitted to the faculty at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Romance Languages Department.

Chapel Hill
2015

Approved By:

Carmen Hsu

Frank Dominguez

Rosa Perelmuter

Margaret Greer

Valeria Finucci

ABSTRACT

Sarah Apffel Cegelski: Monstrosity and Identity in the Comedias of Lope de Vega
(Under the Direction of Carmen Hsu)

Monstrosity and Identity in the Comedias of Lope de Vega is concerned with the relationship between monstrosity and identity formation in early modern Spain. The monster was a popular cultural phenomenon in sixteenth and seventeenth century Spain, appearing in a variety of scientific and literary genres. The monster was not just an extraordinary and unusual creature that elicited reactions of awe, wonder, and terror; it was also considered a sign from God that required careful interpretation to comprehend its meaning. The monster also embodies those characteristics that a society deems undesirable, and so by contrast, it shows what a society accepts and desires as part of its identity. In Lope de Vega's (1562-1635) *comedias,* the playwright depicts characters who challenged the social, political, and religious conventions of his time as monsters. This study of Lope's monsters intends to understand how and why Lope depicted these characters as monsters, and what they can tell us about the behaviors, beliefs, and traditions that Lope rejected as unacceptable or undesirable parts of the Spanish collective identity. It also seeks to understand, by contrast, what Lope thought Spanish identity was, or what he desired it to be. As the founding father of Spanish national theater and the playwright of the masses, this study of Lope's *comedias* and his monsters deepens our understanding of early modern Spanish collective self-fashioning.

To my parents, without whose love and support this would not have been possible.

And to Jeff, Walter, and Sophie, mis almas gemelas.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply indebted to numerous people who have supported me during this project and throughout my graduate career. First, I would like to thank Dr. Carmen Hsu, for wonderful semesters spent in her courses on Golden Age Theater and Cervantes; for accepting nothing less than refinement; and for coaching me to become a better writer and scholar. Her expertise, encouragement, and hours spent discussing text analysis and big ideas have informed this project in so many ways. I must also thank my committee, Dr. Frank Dominguez, Dr. Rosa Perelmuter, Dr. Margaret Greer, and Dr. Valeria Finucci for their insightful comments and suggestions. I am also grateful to Dr. Lucía Binotti and Dr. Juan Carlos González Espitia for their ideas and encouragement early in this process. Thank you to Dr. Glynis Cowell, Dr. Josefa Lindquist, and Dr. Anastacia Kohl, who formed me as a teacher over the last five years, which made me a better scholar.

A dissertation completion fellowship from the Royster Society of Fellows funded my final year of doctoral studies and the last year writing this dissertation. I am thankful for the financial support and the scholarly community the Society afforded me this past year.

My former professors and colleagues Dr. Paul Larson and Dr. Frieda Blackwell have been instrumental in my formation as a scholar and teacher from the very beginning. They also listened to bits and pieces of this project in conferences and conversations and provided helpful feedback. The late Dr. Ricardo Domenech first instilled in me a love for Spanish theater, in a tiny

classroom at the Sede Prim in Madrid during the spring of 2007. I continue to be inspired by his love of the theater. QEPD.

So many friends supported and encouraged me throughout various part of this endeavor, especially Sherry Venere, Kate Gilliom, Whitney Castillo, Thomas Philips, Emily Clark, Paco Brignole, Mercedes Baillargeon, Grant Gearhart, Encanri Cruz Jiménez, Anna Bernard-Hoverstad, Martina Adani, April Weintritt, Giuliano Migliori, and my office mates Mary Greenwood, Stella Soojin Kim, and Michele Sguerri. Anna, Martina, April, and Giuliano housed me on many return trips to Chapel Hill during this last year and I will never forget their hospitality. To all of my other dear ones in Chapel Hill and beyond who are too numerous to be named here, you have enriched my life beyond measure.

To my parents, I am eternally grateful for your sacrifices, love, and support. I could not have completed this journey without your help. To Walter and Sophie, what would I have done without your sweet companionship while I wrote for hours on end? Thank you for loving me and for reminding me to stop working every once in a while, and smile. And finally, a mi Jefe, mi media naranja, thank you for listening, for your patience, your sense of humor, and for believing in me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

> "Perhaps it is time to ask the question that always arises when the monster is discussed seriously […] Do monsters really exist?
>
> Surely they must, for if they do not, how could we?"
>
> ---Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, "Monster Culture"

The monster has long been considered a sign to be read and interpreted.[1] The word *monstruo* derives from the Latin "monstrum," which means portent, an unnatural thing or event regarded as an omen, sign or warning.[2] In the Bible, plagues, exterminations and other catastrophic *portentos* or *prodigios* are seen as punishments from God, signs of divine anger, warnings to correct certain behaviors. Greek and Roman authors such as Pliny, Cicero, and Augustine rejected monstrous births and other anomalous occurrences as portents of imminent

[1] On the history and meaning of the monster from Antiquity through the European Renaissance, see Williams, Wittkower, and Park and Daston (1998). Williams examines the development of the monster in relation to Pseudo-Dionysius' negative theoglogy, as well as provides a taxonomy of medieval monsters and its presence in three heroic genres. Wittkower focuses his study on the history of monsters on the monstrous races and animals that were believed to inhabit the East, especially India. Park and Daston study the history of wonders and marvels (including monsters) and the ways in which European naturalists from the High Middle Ages through the Enlightenment used wonder and wonders, the passion and its objects, to envision themselves and the natural world.

[2] From the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Juan Corominas, in his *Breve diccionario etimológico,* affirms the meaning of the monster as a sign or a warning. He writes that the word *monstruo* is: "Tom. del bajo lat. monstruum, alteración del lat. monstrum id., propte. 'prodigio' (que parece ser derv. de monere 'avisar,' por la creencia en que los prodigios eran amonestaciones divinas" (402).

evil. Later, medieval writers reverted back to the well-established religious tradition of prodigies as divine messages and signs of things–usually undesirable–to come.[3] For example, Saint Isidore of Seville in his *Etimologías* (written c. 627-630 A.D.) says:

> 2. […] Y se conocen con el nombre de portentos, ostentos, monstruos y prodigios, porque anuncian (portendere), manifiestan (ostendere), muestran (monstrare), y predicen (predicare) algo futuro. 3. En efecto, explican que 'portento' deriva de portendere, es decir, anunciar de antemano. Los 'ostentos', porque parecen manifestar algo que va a ocurrir. Los 'prodigios', porque 'dicen previamente' (porro dicere), es decir, predicen lo que va a suceder. Por su parte, monstra deriva su nombre de monitus, porque se 'muestran' para indicar algo, o porque 'muestran' al punto qué significado tiene una cosa. (II: XI, 47)

For Saint Isidore, *portentos, ostentos, prodigios*, and *monstruos* were special signs from God that announced, manifested, demonstrated, and predicted something about the future. The *monstruo* in particular is explained as a sign that indicates or displays the meaning of things. This definition of the monster as a sign remained standard throughout the medieval and early modern periods.[4] For instance, the French surgeon Ambroise Paré (1510?-1590) in his work *Des monstres et prodiges* (1575), interprets the monster this way: "Monstres sont choses qui apparaissent outre le cours de Nature (et sont le plus souvent signes de quelque malheur à advenir) comme un enfant qui naist avec un seul bras, un autre qui aura deux testes, et autres membres outre l'ordinaire" (304). For Paré, *monstruos* are extraordinary beings; manifestations of natural disorder and deviance; and they are still signs, indicators of coming misfortune.

Throughout the Middle Ages and early modern period, the monster appears as a sign in a variety of literary genres, from the dragons of *Beowulf* and *Amadís*, to Shakespearere's monstrous Caliban and the imaginary monsters of *Don Quijote*. One of the monster's often-

[3] On how Cicero, Pliny, and Augustine perceived marvels and portents, see Céard 3-31.

[4] See Daston and Park (1998) 50.

overlooked dwelling places is in the Spanish *comedia*, where, continuing the tradition from biblical times, it serves as a sign to be read. Lope de Vega's (1562-1635) *comedias*, for instance, are populated with monsters. This dissertation studies these manifestations of monstrosity and their significance.

As the embodiment of difference, monsters can provide insights into how Lope and his audience conceived of conventional normality and Otherness.[5] A.S. Mittman explains, "monsters show us how a culture delimits its own boundaries, how it sees itself; what it respects and desires is revealed in these portraits of scorn and disgust" (13). Because the monster embodies those characteristics that society deems undesirable, they also show us the limits of a desired collective identity. Thus, understanding a society's monsters – what it rejects as an acceptable or desired part of its identity – provides a way to understand *what it is* or *what it desires to be*.

A study of Lope's monsters, then, can also shed light on how Lope and his public imagined early modern Spanish identity. J.J. Cohen, in his work, *Monster Theory*, writes about the relationship between monstrosity and identity: "The monster is the abjected fragment that enables the formation of all kinds of identities – personal, national, cultural, economic, sexual, psychological, universal, particular" (20).[6] In other words, through the identification and defining of monsters, individuals and societies are able to define themselves in terms of what they are *not.* S. Greenblatt affirms that self-fashioning in the Renaissance occurs in this way.

---

[5] "Other" here and throughout this study refers to the marginalized Other as conceptualized by Sartre, Lacan, Foucault, and other post-colonial theorists.

[6] On the critical theory of abjection, see Kristeva. See also Vélez-Quiñones's chapter, "Strangers to their Kind: Wildness, Abjection and Primitivism in *Nacimiento de Ursón y Valentín* and *El animal de Hungría,*" in *Monstrous Displays: Representation and Perversion in Spanish Literature*, 41-86. In this chapter Vélez-Quiñones discusses the monstrosity of certain characters in these plays in relation to their abjection.

Renaissance self-fashioning "is achieved in relation to something perceived as alien, strange, or hostile. This threatening Other–heretic, savage, witch, adulteress, traitor, Antichrist–must be discovered or invented in order to be attacked and destroyed" (Greenblatt 9). In the Renaissance the Self is defined by the Other. In Lope's *comedias*, the Other sometimes manifests itself as monstrous characters.[7] By studying them, we can understand Lope's vision of early modern Spanish self-fashioning.

Lope's plays are an excellent vehicle through which to identify the ideas, traditions, values, practices, and people that constituted the collective identity of early modern Spanish people. With the publication of *El arte nuevo de hacer comedias en este tiempo* (1609), he became the first and most emblematic playwright to openly defend a theater created exclusively for the majority of society instead of a select few.[8] To entertain a widely varied public, he contrived the *comedia nueva*, a mixture of traditional Aristotelian theater with new elements that made the *comedia* attractive to a wider audience. To write to entertain a diverse public, he had to look for what unified people from many sectors of Spanish society. He became what F. Ruiz Ramón calls the "intérprete de la colectividad" (*Historia* 186). Several scholars, such as G. Ticknor, R. Arco y Garay, F. Ruiz Ramón (1996), and I. Arellano (1995) have noted the

[7] Here and elsewhere, as I explain later in the Introduction, "monstrous characters" refers to characters that are monstrous because of their real or perceived immorality. Each of the monstrous characters studied in this dissertation has been chosen because he/she is specifically referenced or described as as a monster due to his/her excessive vices and immoral behavior, which results in the disruption of the conventional social, political, or religious order.

[8] J. Albrecht shows in her study *The Playgoing Public of Madrid* that only the nobles, the educated urban elite, and their *escuderos, pajes*, and *lacayos* had the leisure time and money to attend performances at the *corrales*. On Sundays and feast days, well-to-do artisans, shoemakers, and merchants would also frequent the *corrales*. The majority of working people could not afford to attend performances of Lope's plays. However, this information does not detract from the fact that Lope was the first playwright to write eclusively to entertain a diverse, theater-going public.

particularly national character of the complex dramatic universe of Lope's plays.[9] The popular nature and national spirit of Lope's plays provide us with a way to understand not only what monsters meant for him, but also to a cross-section of early modern Spanish people.

The question of whether or not a collective sense of Spanish identity exists in the early modern period is a complicated one due to the sociopolitical and cultural diversity of Spain in the late medieval and early modern time periods. While it is true that the union of Castile and Aragon in 1479, the fall of Granada in 1492, and the annexation of Navarra in 1515 (and of Portugal in 1580) seem to give birth to a new, unified Spain, the unification was more outward than real in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Fernández Albaladejo 21-29). Though the Inquisition, instituted to deal with difference, was active and effective, cultural difference was not eliminated overnight. Each kingdom maintained its own political and administrative identity, and it was not until the eighteenth century that judicial and fiscal unity of the various territories was achieved (J.H. Elliot 372-8; H. Kamen 144-152). M. Herrero García, H. Koenigsberger, and H. Kamen assert that Spaniards in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had little consciousness of their "Spanishness" and that of their "nation," and their identity was based more on local, regional ties because of the lack of uniformity among the kingdoms, races, and religions of the peninsula.

[9] G. Ticknor writes that Lope "gave himself up to the leading of the national spirit…and thus obtained a kind and degree of fame he could never otherwise have reached (166). R. Arco y Garay writes, "Los valores españoles bullían en la mente de los contemporáneos de Lope, espectadores de sus comedias; pero fue él quien pudo y supo expresar tales sentimientos de modo que apariesen como sensaciones nuevas, como experiencias nuevas para el espectador o para el lector" (56). F. Ruiz Ramón highlights the importance of Lope's work as it presents the "punto de vista español – y aquí español no es accidental, sino esencial-desde donde o a través del cual se interpretaba la realidad del universo" (149). I. Arellano calls Lope's comedias at once universal in nature and also "radicalmente españolas" (175). For more on the national character of Lope's comedias, see especially V. Ryjik.

However, as Benedict Anderson has shown, national identity is really an "imagined community."[10] Anderson writes that national identity is an imagined political community because it is impossible for all of its members to meet one another, and so their communion with one another lives in their minds. The nation is imagined as limited, with finite boundaries that define where it ends and another nation begins; and as a community, because regardless of the inequality or pluralism within a nation, it is always conceived as a "deep, horizontal comradeship" (Anderson 8). Following Anderson, scholars such as V. Ryjik and J. Álvarez Junco insist there was indeed a Spanish *conciencia nacional* in the early modern period. Álvarez Junco writes that during the years 1500-1700 Spain was, just as many other European nations, undergoing a process of pre-national identity formation. Though Golden Age Spain's identity was not influenced and formed by print capitalism as were most other European countries, nonetheless its identity formation was happening in two other ways. One was a cultural process, generated by Golden Age literary production and the successes of the monarchy that emphasized the glories of the collective entity of "Spain"; and the second way was popular, transmitted more through ecclesiastical symbolism and ceremonies and, when possible, monarchical rituals, which reinforced the traditional values of loyalty to the king and the Church, honor and *limpieza de sangre*, and xenophobia toward Muslims and Jews (Álvarez Junco 136-137). For V. Ryjik the early modern Spanish *conciencia nacional* was a dynamic process: the transmission of cultural contents within a shared culture, with special emphasis on foundational myth, rooted in a specific territory, that differentiates its particular culture from others. This cultural diffusion created a set of common interests in the collective imaginary (15). Both Ryjik and Álvarez-Junco acknowledge that there is no way to know, nor would it be responsible to assume, that every

[10] See Anderson, especially 5-8, for his definitions of imagined community.

illiterate Spaniard and remote village lived and believed in exactly the same way. However, in the collective imagination of early modern Spaniards there existed a sense of Spanish identity – transmitted through cultural production, symbolism, and ritual – that was comprised of three major components: monarchy, Church, and honor based upon blood purity.

Lope de Vega's *comedias* have long been considered a reflection – direct or disfigured – of Spanish society. While scholars in the first half of the 20th century, such as M. Menéndez y Pelayo (1949) and R. Menéndez Pidal (1940), see Lope's works as a mirror image of Golden Age Spanish society and Spanish national ideals, in the second half of the 20th century critics such as A. Castro (1982), J.Mª. Díez Borque and J.A. Maravall (1944, 1969, 1990) underline the discrepancies between the world of the *comedia* and Spain's social, economic, and political reality, emphasizing the function of Lope's plays as an instrument of the state. Entering the 21st century, scholars such as F. Ruiz Ramón (1998), C. Stern, and M. McKendrick (2000), among many others, contradict this interpretation and argue convincingly that the *comedia* was not merely the mouthpiece of the aristocracic élite, but at once conformist and subversive, responding simultaneously to the influences of official orthodoxy and popular taste (*Playing the King* 1-11). Accepting this multifaceted view of the *comedia*, we can read Lope's plays not as one-dimensional, complacent literature, but as dramatic interpretations that speak to the loyalties of the Spanish people – faith, king, and country – while engaging in the common, lively, and often heated debates of the time on a wide range of social, political, economic, and literary concerns. As E.G. Santo-Tomás writes, it was in the theater, more than any other genre he touched, that Lope channeled his personal and collective concerns about the state of Spain, at once celebrating and questioning its past and present ("Lope de Vega and the Arts of the Nation"

330). In other words, Lope's works are both defenders of the dominant ideology as well as de-stabilizers of that same ideology.

One of the ways Lope was able to simultaneously uphold and interrogate the dominant ideology in plays about a variety of contemporary concerns was through monstrous characters. While the monster was universally considered a sign in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, there were varying philosophies as to the monster's place in nature. These competing notions of how the monster fit into creation were part of what made it an excellent means for expressing competing social, political, and religious ideologies. E. del Río Parra identifies three principal theories that circulate in Spain during this time period.[11] The first is the dominant theory of the sixteenth century, which proceeds from Aristotle. It maintains that the monster is an error or abomination of nature. In its deformity, the monster diminishes or detracts from divine creation, and so is morally reprehensible. The second theory, posed by Augustine, considers monsters to be a natural part of creation, though it recognizes they are rare and unusual cases. The third theory, espoused by intellectuals like Isidore, argues that divine creation does not make anything without a purpose. It says that monsters exist to, by contrast, define and emphasize what is normal. These three contradictory theories on monstrosity coexisted in early modern Spain, and represent the different ways Spanish people perceived monsters' place in the world: as errors that offend the order of creation; as a rare part of nature's diversity; and as beings that, in their abnormality, highlight nature's beauty. This made the monster the perfect vehicle for interpreting both ideological convention and challenges to that convention for the stage: it could exhibit aberration and disorder, and by contrast it could also emphasize the natural order and traditional norms.

[11] See Río Parra (2003) 42-43.

Equally as complex as the multiple views on the monster's place in nature were the early modern definitions of what beings could be considered monsters. Identifying exactly what creatures were considered monstrous in Lope's time is challenging, because early modern writers themselves had difficulty agreeing on one definition. Recently, L. Daston and K. Park establish three main strains of thought that influenced the plurality of definitions of the monster from 1500 onward: the first is the body of scientific work on physiological monsters, for example, Aristotle's and Albertus Magnus' biological writings; the second was the notion of monstrous births as portents; and third was a cosmographical and anthropological view of the monster, concerned with the monstrous races of men widely believed to inhabit Africa and Asia ("Unnatural Conceptions" 22-23). These three coexistent conceptions of the monster encompassed a wide range of beings. Excessively hirsute people, hermaphrodites, homosexuals, giants, dwarfs, unfamiliar animals, fantastical and mythological creatures, and foreign peoples, to name just a few examples, were all considered monsters in the early modern period. D. Wilson explains that the large number of definitions of the monster is also related to the production of *libros de viaje* in the Middle Ages and Renaissance, in which everything discovered that did not fit in to the commonly held concept of what was normal and acceptable was considered to be monstrous (12). As J. Lafuente and N. Valverde have noted, the early modern definition of the monster included everything from mythological creatures to people with physical deformities, until eventually it expanded to include anything that was outside the norms of nature (11).

The definitions of "monstruo" in S. de Covarrubias' *Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española* (1611) and the Real Academia Española's *Diccionario de autoridades* (1734) synthesize the varied early modern conceptions of the monster in early modern Spain by describing it as anything abnormal or outside the natural order. For Covarrubias, the *monstruo* is

principally a birth against the norms of nature, manifested in physical deformities: "cualquier parto contra la regla y orden natural, como nacer el hombre con dos cabeças, quatro brazos y quatro piernas" (1294).[12] The *Diccionario de autoridades* defines *monstruo* more broadly, as monstrous birth, but also:

> Juntas de animales de diversa naturaleza, causan tambien admirables mónstruos. […] Mónstruo no es otra cosa sino un pecado de naturaleza, con que por defecto o sobra, no adquiere la perfección que el viviente habia de tener. […] Por extensión se toma por qualquier cosa excesivamente grande, o extraordinaria en qualquier línea […] Por translación se llama lo que es sumamente feo. (598)

In other words, the monster can also be an extraordinary mixture of beings; an error or imperfection of nature, either by excess or deficiency; anything excessive or extraordinary in any way; it can also be anything aesthetically abhorrent. While in real life any being that was extraordinary or excessive in an admirable or undesirable way could be called a monster, in literature beings with monstrous characteristics most often carry a negative connotation. In Lope's *comedias*, by far the most common connotation of the monster is the negative.

Lope de Vega himself, and his invention, the *comedia nueva*, embody two of the aforementioned examples of monstrosity. For his creative genius and copious dramatic production, Cervantes dubbed Lope *monstruo de naturaleza* in his prologue to *Ocho comedias y ocho entremeses nuevos* (1615). Uncommonly ingenious and extraordinarily productive, as a dramatist Lope stood apart as a marvelous anomaly among his peers and in comparison to conventional human capabilities. He lived and wrote as a real-life monster, outside of nature,

[12] For all quotes from primary sources I have maintained the original spelling and punctuation. Therefore, all misspellings (according to modern standards) in quotes are the result of leaving them in their original form.

excessive in intelligence and genius. His *comedia nueva* is also monstrous in nature.[13] In his *Arte nuevo*, Lope described his dramatic innovation in monstrous terms. Employing a number of monstrous images, *vil quimera, monstruo cómico, Minotauro, hipogrifos, semones,* and *centauros*), he invoked the fundamental hybridity of the *comedia,* which mixes tragic and comic elements. To cater to the interests and curiosities of everyone from the *vulgo* to the king, Lope created a monstrous dramatic art that seamlessly juxtaposed the unnatural (for his time) partners of old and new, tragedy and comedy. The violation of the classicist rules of poetic composition was seen as a monstrously immoral perversion of poetic forms and stylistic conventions, and created concerns for the moral integrity of the secular comedia; according to Golden Age literary theory, aesthetics and morality were intertwined (Kluge 298-299). Literary theorists were concerned that the aesthetic contamination of pure form, produced by the mixture of dramatic genres, implied a moral impurity. Lope and his followers had to defend his "monstrous" theater against critiques of its immorality by arguing that the comedia's mixture allowed him to please the audience by more closely imitating the world of man in its comedy *and* tragedy, providing a way by which to morally instruct his audience through delight (Kluge 313). The creator of a monstrous body of work in its size and its character, Lope and his work epitomize two conceptions of early modern monstrosity.

In its extraordinary nature, the monster can also connote immorality. The *Diccionario*'s definition of *monstruosidad* includes this moral component: "Por translación se toma por suma fealdad ù desproporición, en lo physico ù en lo moral" (599). This definition shows us that the monster embodies not only physical disproportion, but also moral disproportion; in other words,

[13] On the monstrous nature of Lope's tragicomedy, see Kluge, who discusses the process by which the immoral "monster" of the tragicomic Spanish theater, which fully bloomed with Lope's dramatic production, was finally accepted as the moral *comedia* by the time it reached its expression by Calderón.

monsters can be physical monsters or moral monsters. J. de Rivilla de Bonet y Pueyo's *Desvíos de la Naturaleza o Tratado de el origen de los monstruos*, published in Lima in 1695, explains these two types of monsters. There are monsters who were perfectly created by a God whom we cannot fully comprehend; and there are monsters who become such by their own immoral behavior. The former belongs to "la hermosura y variedad de la naturaleza, como a la incomprehensible ciencia del autor estas deformidades" (Chapter 5, 39v) and by contrast, emphasizes the beauty of the Author's creation. The latter are monsters because "aquella fealdad incomparable por donde el pecado hace a los hombres monstruos interiores, más terribles que los mismos monstruos, dependiendo estos de accidente, y aquellos de las costumbres" (Chapter 5, 39r). Here Rivilla explains that of the two types of monsters, the monster that becomes such by its own immorality and sinful actions, and not by *accidente*, is the worst of the two kinds. In sum, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the monster is an extraordinary mixture, anything outside the conventional order of nature, either physically or morally, and the moral monster is a particularly abhorrent kind. While many kinds of monsters appear in Lope's dramatic corpus, the most common monster one finds in the *comedia lopesca*, and the topic of this study, is the moral monster.[14]

[14] I exclude from my study of monsters the *hombre salvaje* or the *mujer salvaje*, both of which pertain to a parallel but distinct tradition to that of monsters, and have been studied extensively by R. Bernheimer, E. Dudley and M.E. Novak, R. Bartra (1992, 1997), S. López Ríos (1999, 2006), J.A. Madrigal, D. Olivares Martinez, and, in Lope, by F. Antonucci. I also exclude exceptional types such as the *mujer varonil*, a character that has been examined by F. Rodriguez de la Flor, J. Sanz Hermida, M. McKendrick (1974), and C. Bravo-Villasante. I do not disagree with E. Lagresa, who writes on the monstrous nature of the *mujer varonil* in her article, "Monstruos de la naturaleza. Violencia y feminidad en *La varona castellana* de Lope de Vega," but here I sought to focus on characters that are specifically referred to as monsters in the plays.

Lope, of course, was not the only writer of his time crafting stories about monsters. He capitalized on an already popular cultural phenomenon that appeared in almost every genre of Golden Age Spanish literature. The monster appears especially in certain genres and formats, including *relaciones de sucesos, avisos de forasteros, cartas impresas* and *pliegos sueltos.* Spanish historians and geographers in the sixteenth century translate these documents from throughout Europe, and in the seventeenth century they continue to be read with enthusiasm. The *tratadistas* not only repeat what their original sources have said, but add new examples to the existing ones, write their own treatises on monsters, and theorize new causes of abnormality. E. del Río Parra cites these translations, original productions, and exchanges of theories on monstrosity as evidence of interest in monsters and monstrosity in the sixteenth century and especially the seventeenth century in Spain (*Una era de monstruos* 20). Given the considerable cultural production about monsters, and the widely held interest in them, it is not surprising that monsters are also prevalent in other genres of Golden Age Spanish literature. Examples include some of the most important and influential works of the time such as Góngora's poem "Polifemo y Galatea" (1613); Calderón's play *La vida es sueño* (1636); and several masterpieces of prose such as Rojas' *La Celestina* (1499); Cervantes' *El Quijote* (1605, 1615) and *Persiles y Sigismunda* (1617); and Gracián's *El Criticón* (1651, 1652, and 1657).[15] In addition, the *crónicas de Indias*, such as Colón's *Diario de abordo* (1492); Sahagún's *Historia General de las cosas de Nueva España* (c. 1540-1585); and Oviedo's *Historia general y natural de las Indias* (First part published in 1535, all three parts published together posthumously in 1851), describe monstrous

[15] On monstrosity in "Polifemo," see M. Ancell; in *La Vida es Sueño*, see R. González Echeverría; in *La Celestina*, see J. Dangler; in *El Quijote*, see R. Miñana; in *Persiles y Sigismunda*, see A. K. Forcione; in *El Criticón,* see R. Miñana's Introduction and conclusion, as well as J. Checa and P. Ilie. On the monster in the *crónica*, see studies such as those by J. García Arranz (1997) and by E. Stols, W. Thomas, and J. Verberckmoes.

beings of the New World, showing early modern Spanish enthusiasm for the monsters–real and imagined–that inhabited territory abroad.

These works and others contain an assortment of monsters, from the physical, to the fantastical, to the moral. The monster is always, however, interpreted as a sign. For instance, for Gracián the monster "es un signo que expone las incertidumbres del mundo, la relatividad moral que el hombre enfrenta a cada paso. El monstruo, con su carácter extremo y fuera de lo ordinario, despierta al hombre a la verdad de la interpretación" (Miñana 14). Andrenio and Critilo encounter one monster after another on their journey, extraordinary and hybrid beings that embody good and evil, barbarity and civilization, the abject and the attractive; in essence, the complexity of human nature and existence. For example, Andrenio visits the *Anfiteatro de monstruosidades,* whose lavish exterior disguises an interior full of society's monsters who are ruled by vice and sin, displaying the deception prevalent among the privileged and wealthy. He also encounters *El Engaño*, a prince who drives a luxurious chariot, but is also: "un monstruo: digo, muchos en uno, porque ya era blanco, ya negro; ya mozo, ya viejo; ya pequeño, ya grande; ya hombre, ya mujer; ya persona y ya fiera" (153). The monstrous mixture of *El Engaño* conveys that deception knows no boundaries. It is of different colors, genders, ages, sizes, and species; it includes us all. Andrenio, like the reader, must learn to see through deceiving physical appearances to discern the inner monstrosities hidden beneath them. The dual character of Gracián's monsters embodies the complexity of human nature, encompassing savagery and civilization, temptation and repulsion, good and evil (Miñana 19). Gracián's monsters show us that, like Adrenio, we must interpret the sign of the monster to determine whether it is moral and admirable, or immoral and destestable; and also to understand if we should be more like the

monster to ensure our salvation, or if we should distance ourselves from it and condemn its evil nature.

While Miñana hails Gracián's monsters as one of the best ways to understand the epistemology of the Golden Age Spanish monster, I posit that if we look to the generation before Gracián, Lope de Vega offers another vehicle for comprehending its meaning. Taking into account the early modern definitions of monstrosity, my dissertation studies Lope's moral monsters, and examines how he utilized the text and the stage to create them for a diverse audience. Lope's comedias were viewed by a theater-going public in the *corrales* and also read in printed form, so my analysis takes into account not only the textual component of Lope's *comedias*, but also the visual and audio effects of the plays and the dynamic nature of theater.[16] It considers such components as stage directions, characters' speech and behavior, and costume. Recognizing the monster as a sign, this study also seeks to understand what these monstrous characters mean; that is, what they display, indicate, or signify in their respective plays. Finally, considering the monster as a representative of difference, my analysis attempts to elicit how Lope imagined self-fashioning in early modern Spain. In other words, it seeks to understand what Lope's monsters can tell us about how sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Spaniards saw themselves, their society, and the Other. Given that Lope's plays at once defended and challenged the dominant ideologies of his time, the monster can show us what ideas and beings Lope and his audience rejected or accepted.

In spite of the significant cultural presence monsters in early modern Spain, there are still relatively few studies of them. R. Wittkower, C. Kappler, J.F. Friedman, J. Baltrusaitis, D. Williams, J. Leclercq-Marx, and B. Bildhauer and R. Mills have extensively studied the monster

[16] In his prologue to *Parte XVII de las comedias de Lope de Vega Carpio*, Lope acknowledges the value of reading the plays in print, in addition to seeing them represented in the theater.

in the Middle Ages. On monstrosity in the Early Modern period, L. López Gutierrez, D. Wilson, and K. Park and L. Daston (1988) have produced the most important studies on the history of its presence and meaning to sixteenth- and seventeenth-century people. In the specific case of Spain, E. del Río Parra offers the most complete historical and literary account of the monster's presence in Golden Age Spain. H. Vélez-Quiñones explores how early modern Spanish literature represents some behaviors, ideologies, and identities as perverse or monstrous, and R. Miñana has examined monstrosity in the works of Cervantes. Studies on the monster in the *relaciones de sucesos* are numerous: for example, those by H. Ettinghousen, A. Redondo (1995, 1996), A. Morel D'Aleux, J. García Arranz (1999), C. Carranza, and C. Hsu. Of the monster in the Spanish colonies of the New World, we have studies such as those by J. García Arranz (1997) and by E. Stols, W. Thomas, and J. Verberckmoes. The book *Monstruos y seres imaginarios en la Biblioteca Nacional* is a useful resource for the study of early modern Spanish monsters because it is a collective work that includes a selection of extant materials in the Biblioteca Nacional on monstrosity in Spain, with interesting contributions by K. Park, F. Vásquez García, A. Moreno Mengíbar, N. Valverde, A. Lafuente and M. Hagner.

Though my research demonstrates the prevalence of monstrous characters in Lope de Vega's dramatic production, these manifestations of monstrosity have largely overlooked by *lopistas* and of scholars of Spanish Golden Age theater.[17] E. Lagresa, H. Vélez-Quiñones (1995, 1999), E. del Río Parra (2003), and Gónzalez-Ruiz (2009, 2010) are the only scholars to my knowledge to specifically address the significance of monstrosity in *comedias* by Lope, and none

[17] To an extent, Mazur and Antonucci also address the monster, but they only approach the monster as the *salvaje*. While the *salvaje* may in a sense be considered a type of monster, looking at a monstrous character that is also *salvaje* through the lens of monstrosity produces a different understanding of the character than an analysis of the character as only a savage man or woman.

has done so in relation to identity. Of these, Lagresa's article studies the monstrous nature of the *mujer varonil* in Lope's *La varona castellana*. Vélez-Quiñones studies monstrosity in relation to cross-dressing and sodomy in *El rufián Castrucho*; wildness, abjection and monstrosity in *Nacimiento de Ursón y Valentín* and *El animal de Hungría*; and monstrosity and perversion of familial and political relationships in *El castigo sin venganza*; in addition to monstrosity in works by Galdós and Gómez Arcos. My analysis of *Nacimiento de Ursón y Valentín* and *El animal de Hungría* expands upon the analysis of H. Vélez-Quiñones' study of the plays by showing how Lope uses some characters' monstrosity (or falsely perceived monstrosity) to critique the early modern Spanish obsession with the honor code. E. del Río Parra's study focuses on the historical, cultural, scientific, and medical depictions of the monster in the seventeenth century. In her fourth chapter she examines the monster's appearance in Baroque literature, centering her study of literature around *bestiarios, herbarios, libros de viaje*, and other related genres. She briefly mentions the origins of *Animal de Hungría* as being rooted in the image of a legendary monster called the Monster of Buda, but apart from that reference she does not study monstrosity in Lope's works. Finally, J. González Ruiz studies the monstrosity in Lope's *La prueba de los ingenios* and its relation to homoeroticism. *Monstrosity and Identity in the Comedias of Lope de Vega* seeks to fill the void, at least in part, of studies on monstrosity in early modern Spain, its literature, and specifically in Lope's theater.

This dissertation is necessarily limited in scope. It does not intend to offer a panorama of monstrous characters in all of Lope's works, nor in Golden Age theater as a whole. By looking at six representative plays by Lope, I try to bring to light the significance of monsters in his plays. As the paradigmatic and most prolific of playwrights of his time, Lope is also a good starting point for the study of monsters in the works of other playwrights of sixteenth- and seventeenth-

century Spain, such as Tirso de Molina (1579-1648), Juan Ruiz de Alarcón (1581-1639), and Pedro Calderón de la Barca (1600-1681). It is my hope that this project encourages other scholars of Golden Age Spanish theater to investigate this topic further in the works of Lope and his contemporaries.

The texts for this dissertation were chosen with the aid of the *Teatro Español del Siglo de Oro (TESO)* website, which houses the most comprehensive, digitized, word-searchable database of early modern Spanish theatrical works available today. It contains 252 *comedias* by Lope de Vega and 314 of his theatrical works in total. One can word-search the plays by title, author, keyword, date, or any combination of these categories. A search of Lope's plays using *TESO* reveals that monstrous characters can be found in the pages of 116 of Lope's plays. To select my corpus, I searched the database of Lope's plays using key words from early modern definitions of "monster" and "monstrosity," and then I carefully read those plays that produced results. Rather than focusing on the scientific veracity of the monstrous characters of these plays, I looked into the iconographic and narrative representation of them and their significance to the work as a whole. During my reading, I selected only the texts in which the monstrous character was central to the theme of the work, and not merely decorative. I found that six plays in particular displayed specific references to monsters that had strong connections to the major themes and messages of each of the works, so I selected these six plays for close analysis. Thus, the six plays chosen for this study does not reflect all of Lope's dramas in which monstrous characters are present, but rather the most relevant for a study of the function of monstrosity in relation to the major theme(s) of the work.

Each of the chapters of this dissertation includes plays with similar types of monstrous characters that each speak to early modern Spanish identity. Chapter One, "Monstrosity and

(Dis)Honor," examines dishonored women and envious and lustful nobles as monsters in *El animal de Hungría* (written c. 1608-1617, published 1617) and *Nacimiento de Ursón y Valentín, hijos del rey de Francia* (written 1588-1595, published 1604).[18] In this chapter I argue that Lope uses monsters to examine the conception of honor as social reputation and also as individual virtue, and how the two paradigms of honor sometimes conflict with one another. I also show that the monster reflects early modern Spaniards' anxieties about purity of blood, honor as reputation, and social identity. This chapter speaks to the social identity of early modern Spain. Chapter Two, "Monstrosity and Tyranny," studies the tyrant king character as monster in *Roma abrasada* (written c.1595-1603, published 1625) and *El gran duque de Moscovia* (written after 1613, published 1617).[19] Here I explain how Lope appropriates historical accounts of tyrannical monarchs to use them as "spaces for debate" on the various political philosophies of his time around what constitutes an ideal king. In both plays, Lope employs a discourse of monstrosity to enter contemporary deliberations about sovereignty and to dramatize the complex nature of the monarchy in seventeenth-century Spain. This chapter addresses political identity construction. Chapter Three, "Monstrosity and (Re)Conquest" analyzes characters who "discover" and "are discovered" as monsters in *El nuevo mundo descubierto por Cristóbal Colón* (written c. 1598-1603, published 1614) and *Las batuecas del duque de Alba* (written c.1598-1600, published

[18] Dates reflect dates of composition and are according to the analysis of S. Griswold Morley and Courtney Bruerton, *Cronología de las comedias de Lope de Vega.* Morley and Bruerton put *El animal* between 1608 and 1612, with the most probable date being 1611 or 1612. In the prologue to his edition of the play, Emilio Cotarelo y Mori places it in 1617, the same year in which it was printed. See his introduction to "El animal de Hungría."

[19] Dates for *Roma abrasada* are according to Morley and Bruerton. While Morely and Bruerton conclude *El gran duque de Moscovia* was written around 1606, Brody convincingly argues that it must have been written after 1613.

1638).[20] This chapter demonstrates that in re-writing stories from Spain's history for the stage, Lope adds monstrous characters to address concerns about the expansion of the Spanish empire and the role of sin in Spain's national history. Here I also discuss Spain's identity as a Christian nation and as an expanding empire. The conclusion examines the implications of the results of each chapter, offering an assessment of the identity of Lope's monsters, how he dramatized early modern Spanish self-fashioning, and his vision of Spanish national identity.

This dissertation contributes to current scholarship on early modern Spanish and European literature and cultural studies. By approaching Lope's conception of identity through monstrosity for the first time, it provides a novel means by which to better comprehend the playwright's understanding of Spanish conceptions of the Self and the Other. It reveals new insights about the interconnectedness of science, religion, politics, and cultural production in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Speaking to the discussion of alterity through an interdisciplinary approach, it addresses two key fields of modern enquiry in the humanities and social sciences. Creating a dialogue between Otherness and social, political, and religious concerns, this project contributes to our understanding of how we deal with disparate ideologies regarding social-political issues of the twenty-first century.

[20] The approximate dates of composition listed for *El nuevo mundo* are according to Morley and Bruerton, while the publication date comes from Lauer, "The Iberian Encounter of America in the Spanish Theater of the Golden Age" (33). On the dates listed for *Las Batuecas,* Menéndez Pelayo states the work was probably written between 1604-1614, but Morley and Bruerton insist the work was earlier, written between 1598-1600, and certainly not after 1604.

Chapter I

Monstrosity and (Dis)Honor in *El animal de Hungría* and *Ursón y Valentín, hijos del rey de Francia*

In the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries in Spain, the noble class gradually lost its military function and there was an acceleration in the social climbing of the middle classes, muddling traditional caste divisions and privileges.[21] Other forms of self- and class-definition became necessary, and central to these was the notion of honor as *limpieza de sangre*.[22] Purity of blood, more than any other trait, affected the taxes one paid, the positions one could aspire to, the favors and privileges one could receive, the marriage one could enter into, the amount of wealth one could accumulate, access to certain schools, and more.[23] What was most important was not whether or not one was actually *limpio* and therefore honorable, but whether he was considered to be so by others; thus honor came to signify having the reputation of pure blood. The notion that Jewishness was ineradicable gained ground in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and so the stain of mixed blood, or even the suspicion of it, was a great concern. The possibility of being accused of impurity and falling into social disgrace was an

[21] My sources for historical information on what follows are Dominguez-Ortíz (1991, 1992) and Callahan.

[22] On the notions of *honor* as individual virtue and *honra* as social reputation, and the importance of race to Spanish identity, see Castro (1961) and Toro. Note that virtue here does not refer to theological or supernatural virtue, but the public virtue of classical antiquity; a noble is expected to live virtuously in a public sense. See Callahan 5 Note 20. On the relationship of honor to Christian morality, see Jones (1958) and Dunn.

[23] Dominquez-Ortiz (1991) 191-209, and Callahan 3-6.

ever-present threat to all but the wealthiest and most powerful Spaniards, and options for recourse against accusations were insufficient to repair a sullied social reputation.[24] As a result, as McKendrick explains, Spanish society became "obsessed with its identity and with the components of that identity as it conceived it: rank and blood and the concept of honour in which these found their articulation and their intellectual justification" (*Identities in Crisis* 29).[25] Having and protecting honor consumed almost all Spaniards, from the noble to the *vulgo*, because it defined their individual and social identities in an atmosphere of mobility and insecurity among social classes.

Lope de Vega, recognizing the importance of honor to his audience, wrote in his *Arte Nuevo*: "los casos de honra son mejores,/ porque mueven con fuerza a toda gente" (vv. 327-328). To entertain a Spanish society gripped by its identity and the honor that shaped it, he crafted plays that spoke to the concerns of his audience.[26] Like other Golden Age authors, he most often depicted the notion of honor through the immaculate female character, who functioned as the receptacle of male honor.[27] In *El animal de Hungría* and *Nacimiento de Ursón y Valentín, hijos*

[24] S. Taylor outlines the ways in which honor was used in the legal realm to alter or restore social order through insults to a person's honor, insults which varied in nuance according to who uttered the insult, to whom, and where. Taylor argues that the "honor code" should really be considered a "rhetoric of honor," which he defines as "the conscious use of phrases, gestures, and actions…to convey information about the issues in contention while simultaneously advancing a violent confrontation" (21).

[25] On the notion of the identity crisis of early modern Spain, see McKendrick (2002).

[26] Though C.A. Jones (1965) argues that critics should focus more on honor as artistic device and less as historical phenomenon, I agree with McKendrick (2002) that "history has its part to play in our assessment and appreciation of the artist's transformation of life into art, and specifically that in the case of the honour theme a full awareness of the contextual leads to richer textual appreciation" (4).

[27] This theme prevailed in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Spanish literature. For instance, we find it in Cervantes' "El curioso impertinente" and "El celoso extremeño"; Calderón's *El medico*

del rey de Francia, that female character is a queen who is sentenced to death because an envious noble accuses her of adultery, offending the King's honor. The queens survive their sentences and they, or their progeny, live in the wild as monsters. This chapter examines how, in these two plays, Lope explores the notions of honor and identity not only in the sexuality of the female characters, but also through the way in which these dishonored female characters are are construed as monsters by *el qué dirán*, by the power of the false accusations of others who are the true monsters, the moral monsters in the play.

In *El animal de Hungría*, Teodosia is married to King Primislao. Her sister, Faustina, falsely claims she is an adulterer and so the King condemns Teodosia to death. She is left in the wild to be devoured by animals, but she survives to live as an animal-like monster.[28] Faustina marries King Primislao and gives birth to a girl, Rosaura. Teodosia steals Rosaura from Faustina and raises her as her own in the wild. Teodosia and Rosaura terrorize the villagers by attacking them to steal food. Rosaura is transformed when she falls in love with Felipe, the son of the Count of Barcelona who has also been left out in the woods to die but is raised by a shepherd. When Felipe is imprisoned for defending Rosaura against hunters, Rosaura goes to the palace to rescue him, and there, all the characters convene and their true identities are revealed. Teodosia

---

de su honra and *El pintor de su deshonra*; and Claramonte's *La Estrella de Sevilla*. For more on this topic, see McKendrick (2002) 19-39. Also see Sicroff for an explanation as to why *limpieza* and the *converso* did not make good subjects for the stage. See also Van Beysterveldt, who asserts that the force that drives the Golden Age Spanish *comedia's* action is not honor represented by blood purity.

[28] In medieval Europe, the wild had two faces: it was either a kind of Paradise, or a place where one met Satan and his demons (Le Goff 50-51). In opposition to the wilderness was the "world," or organized society (Le Goff 58). The contrast between the wild and society represented the contrast not between city and country, but between nature and culture (Le Goff 58). For more on the significance of the medieval wild, see Le Goff 47-59.

is restored as queen, Rosaura is given in marriage to Felipe, the future Count of Barcelona, and Faustina is banished to a convent.

Ursón y Valentín tells a similar story of treachery and monstrosity. Margarita and Clodoveo are the King and Queen of France. Uberto, a courtesan, is in love with Margarita. When Margarita rejects him, he accuses her of adultery and the King sentences her to death. Uberto convinces the King to throw the queen out to the wild to be devoured by animals. She survives and gives birth to twin boys. The first, Ursón, is carried off by a bear to be raised in a cave, and the second, Valentín, is raised by his mother among shepherds. As he grows, Valentín becomes curious about his true identity and learns of his mother's dishonor by Uberto. He goes to the King's court and joins the King's hunting entourage on their journey to kill a monster (Ursón) that has been terrorizing the villagers. While hunting, Valentín finds himself in the woods with both Ursón and Uberto at once, and mortally wounds Uberto to avenge his mother's dishonor, letting Ursón, his long lost twin brother, live. Before Uberto dies, he admits his guilt to the King. Ursón takes his place as royal heir, and his and Valentín's weddings are announced.[29]

Two types of monsters appear in these plays. The first kind is the moral monster, embodied in Faustina and Uberto. They are moral monsters because they are motivated by envy

[29] Lope's inspiration for this play was a French chivalric novel entitled, *Valentin et Orson*. From this source, Lope copies the false accusation of the Queen (which in *Valentín et Orson* is the emperor of Constantinople), the birth of the twins and the kidnapping of one by a bear, and the capture of Orsón by Valentin. Antonucci (66 Note 15) offers a lengthy explanation of the differences in the play and its sources, adding that an additional source could be a text that pertains to the Carolingian cycle, *El noble cuento del emperador Carlos Maybes y de la reyna Sevilla, su mujer*. What interests us most about Antonucci's catalog of similarities and differences among Lope's version and his course is that one of Lope's principal additions is an emphasis on Ursón's inner journey from animal to human, an element that is completely missing from the sources and which is Lope's novel addition to the story.

and lust to unfairly dishonor innocent women.[30] The second kind of monster is a false monster. This type of monster includes innocent characters that are converted into monsters because of untrue accusations that they have a committed the immoral act of adultery. This type of monster is embodied in Teodosia and Margarita. Finally, Rosaura is innocent but displays her mother Faustina's moral monstrosity; and Ursón is innocent, but displays his mother's perceived immorality.

The audience learns of Faustina's moral monstrosity from her sister, Teodosia, who tells the story of her sister's vicious treachery at the beginning of the play. Teodosia explains that the sins of envy and lust motivated Faustina's betrayal. Faustina was traveling to the palace to visit her sister and the king, when "por el camino, ciega/ del valor de Primislao,/ a envidiar mi bien comienza…Creció la envidia, y los celos,/ hasta que, cayendo enferma,/ mi esposo la visitaba,/ que era la salud más cierta" (I, 423).[31] After becoming ill with envy, she not only gains the sympathy of Primislao, but she then falsely accuses Teodosia of adultery with the King of Scotland. Envy is one vice that turns Faustina into a moral monster. Lust is a second vice that contributes to her monstrous immorality. At the end of the play, Faustina confesses her "Amor" may not have been reason enough to betray her sister. She declares, "en malicia y traición/ he sido monstruo en el suelo./ Maté mi inocente hermana,/ y también su casto honor;/ no sé si es disculpa Amor/ que fue traición inhumana" (III, 447-448). Her transgressive love for Primislao causes her to commit a "traición inhumana" against her sister and the King. Realizing her error,

[30] See Kallendorf for a study of the influences of the Ten Commandments and the Seven Deadly Sins on the moral codes of early modern Spanish theater.

[31] This and all future citations of text from the plays will include the Act number followed the page number on which the text can be found, in the format (Act, Page), due to the fact that the best editions for five out of the six works studied in this dissertation do not include verse numbers.

she confesses her treacherous act makes her a monster, the incarnation of excessive envy and disordered love. Lope depicts her as the true monster of the play because her immoral act causes the unjust dishonor and social death of her innocent sister and queen. She betrays her family, her King, and God, thereby presenting a greater threat to societal, political, and religious order than Teodosia's perceived monstrosity, which is only the result of false accusations that she committed an immoral act.

The connection between sin–especially envy and lust–and monstrosity was common in early modern European culture and would not have been lost on Lope's audience. The Seven Deadly Sins were each associated with a demon, a monstrous being who embodied the sin.[32] The sin of envy was associated with Leviathan, often represented as a serpent sea-monster. In the theater envy is also represented as a monster, for example in Calderón de la Barca's play *El mayor monstruo, los celos,* and Shakespeare's *Othello*, in which Iago warns of envy, "the green-eyed monster" (Act III, Scene III). Lust was commonly linked with the monstrous demon, Asmodeus, made up of various parts of a man, rooster, serpent, sheep, bull, and dragon, all of which represent lust, lasciviousness, or revenge. Asmodeus also inspired the monstrous Minotaur character, the result of Pasiphae's lust for a bull, in Lope's *Laberinto de Creta* (published 1621).[33] These well-known images of monsters related to sins would have allowed Lope's audience to connect both Faustina's and Uberto's sins to their monstrosity.

The sin of lust is also what makes Uberto a moral monster. He confesses that lust leads him to pursue Queen Margarita: "amor infame,/ que debe de ser demonio,/ quiere que yo le

[32] On the depiction of sins as monsters, see Binsfeld, who published the authoritative list of demons and their associated sins, including demons associated with the Seven Deadly Sins.

[33] For an analysis of the role of desire in *El Laberinto de Creta*, See Kidd.

difame" (I, 178). The disordered love he has for Margarita originates from the devil and inspires him to dishonor the one he desires. When she rejects him and he loses his chance to dishonor her physically, he instead dishonors her reputation, by falsely accusing her of adultery. He says that when he accused her, he was "Ciego, con el furor de amor lascivo" (III, 250). Uberto's malicious action occurs while he is blinded by his carnal desire. His disordered sexual desire causes him to stain the honor of the innocent queen. Ursón is identified as the true monster when Valentín encounters both Ursón and Uberto at once while on a hunt with the King's men. Having learned from his mother that Uberto was the cause of her unjust dishonor, when he finds Ursón and Uberto at the same time, he proclaims, "Yo por el monstruo he venido,/ mas este monstruo es Uberto," and kills Uberto instead of Ursón (II, 240). Valentín designates Uberto, the lustful villain, as the monster, and not Ursón, because Uberto's moral monstrosity is a greater threat to honor and social order than Ursón's familial misfortune that converts him into a monster.

Through Faustina and Uberto, Lope conveys that people who commit immoral acts should be identified and treated as dishonorable and as monsters, and not those people who are accused or merely suspected of being immoral based on the unreliable word of others. In other words, one's honor and the social identity attached to it should be determined by one's virtue and moral behavior, and should not be based on reputation alone. Antonucci affirms that Lope dramatizes a vision of the world "en la que identidad social y comportamiento moral del individuo son solidarios, salvo rarísimas excepciones" (86). For Lope, morality and social identity should be intertwined with one another. This is why the virtuous Teodosia and Margarita are restored to their original social identities, while the monstrously immoral Faustina and Uberto are relegated to the social margins through the entrance into a convent and death, respectively.

Though Faustina and Uberto are moral monsters, an apparently noble exterior hides their inner monstrosity.[34] Valentín, describing Uberto's death, underlines the danger Uberto presents because his monstrosity is invisible to others: "En fin, matóse el monstruo . . . La tierra bebe ya su sangre indígena./ Un monstruo, un basilisco, que encubierto/ estaba en Francia, esclavo del demonio . . . El visorrey Uberto" (III, 247). Here, Uberto is described as a basilisk: a fantastic animal with a snake's body, a pointed head and three-pointed crest, whose gaze was believed to be lethal (Cirlot 23). Uberto's lustful gaze toward Margarita is what causes her and her sons' conversion into monsters; but his own basilisk-like moral monstrosity has been hidden in France, enslaved by the Devil, while Margarita, Ursón, and Valentín suffer the effects of his dishonesty. Ursón's deception is dangerous because a noble appearance hides his sin, his potential to dishonor others, and to disorder a social structure defined by honor.

Faustina'a outward appearance does not indicate her immorality, but her inner moral monstrosity is outwardly manifested in two other ways: in her inability to produce an heir that lives past one year, and in her only surviving child, the monstrous Rosaura. Of the first, Teodosia explains: "Parió Faustina contenta/ dos o tres veces, y todos/ sus hijos dicen que llegan/ a cumplir un año el día/ que me echaron a las fieras,/ y que no pasan de allí;/ y espero que también

[34] The contrast between Uberto's and Faustina's outer appearances and their inner monstrosity represents the deceitful nature of the court, outwardly exemplary and pure, secretly immoral and corrupt. Fray Antonio de Guevara's *Menosprecio de la corte y alabanza de aldea* asserts that the court is a place where sin, vice and deception reign, and Faustina and Uberto illustrate its danger. See Guevara, especially Chapter VII. He writes, "[e]s privilegio de aldea que allí sean los hombres más virtuosos y menos viciosos, lo cual no es así por cierto en la corte y en las grandes repúblicas, a do hay mil que os estorben el bien y cien mil que os inciten al mal. . . . No sólo es buena el aldea por el bien que tiene, mas aun por los males de que carece; porque allí no hay estados de que tener envidia, no hay cambios para dar a usura, no hay botillería para pecar en la gula, no hay dineros para ahuchar, no hay damas para servir, no hay bandos con quien competir, no hay cortesanas a quien requerir, no hay justas para se vestir, no hay tableros a do jugar, no hay justicias a quien temer; no hay chancillerías a do se perder, y lo que es mejor de todo, no hay letrados que nos pelen ni médicos que nos maten" (Chapter VII).

sea/ en esta ocasión, que dicen/ que el parto de un hijo espera,/ porque está pronosticado" (I, 423-424). All of Faustina's children die on the one-year anniversary of the day Teodosia was thrown into the woods (the exact date is not mentioned). As illegitimate children, they should not inherit the throne, and as such they are doomed to an early death. The date of their death, the anniversary of the day Teodosia was thrown to the beasts, means that Faustina's disordered desire, which also "kills" Teodosia, is connected to their infant mortality. In other words, Faustina's sin and illegitimacy results in her inability to produce an heir. The death of potentially illegitimate heirs for King Primislao echoes the control Spanish people desired over bloodline, to prevent questions of their own social legitimacy and inheritance. As Cohen writes, "[t]hrough the body of the monster fantasies of aggression, domination, and inversion are allowed safe expression in a clearly delimited and permanently liminal space" ("Monster Theory" 18). The failure of Faustina's body to produce legitimate children represents an idealization of the supremacy of the dominant order, where virtue, purity, and legitimacy suppress vice, disorder, and illegitimacy.

Rosaura, Faustina's daughter and her only child to survive, also visually manifests Faustina's sins. One of the ways she shows Faustina's monstrosity is through the circumstances of her birth, which resemble those of a monstrous birth. Faustina enters the stage, holding a baby, and says: "Que apenas decir oí/ de aqueste animal o rayo/ de Hungría, cuando un desmayo/ en el corazón sentí/ tan mortal, que me caí/ en las hierbas de aquel prado,/ donde, habiendo despertado,/ hallé en juncos y espadañas/ el fruto de mis entrañas,/ como traidor, desdichado" (I, 429). While waiting for the King, she hears the name of the Animal de Hungría (Teodosia), feels a sharp and deadly sensation in her heart, faints, and upon waking finds she has given birth to a child.

M. H. Huet writes that in Renaissance Europe it was commonly believed that a woman's imagination could affect the outcome of the child's birth; for instance, a woman who contemplated a particular image during conception could have a child that resembled that image.[35] The female imagination could be so powerful that it could overpower the male role in the creation of the child, causing the offspring to physically resemble the image in her mind instead of the father. Huet explains, "Multiple causes were cited for the heightening of the maternal imagination's power and its resulting usurpation of the father's role. They could be accidental, or derive from longtime habits; they could reflect a fright, a desire, or bear the mark of a particular trauma" (16). In Faustina's case, it is her fright that contributes to the monstrous birth of her child. While the King and his men discuss the monstrous appearance of the Animal de Hungría before leaving on their hunt, the King warns, "Calla, que ocasión darás/ a que la Reina se espante" (I, 428). But his warning comes too late, as Faustina says she has begun to feel pain, exclaiming, "¡Ay … no sé que siento en mí!" (I, 428). Though Faustina tries to attribute her pain to the sun or some other unknown cause, she expresses her feelings in the exact moments they are discussing Teodosia's frightening appearance, linking the two events to one another. Then, after the hunting party leaves, at the mention of the Animal, she again feels pain and faints, and gives birth. While we do not know from the characters about the specifics of the child's conception, we do know from the actions and speech of the characters on stage that the pregnant Faustina is visually and audibly affected by her envisioning of the monstrous Animal de Hungría. Lope's audience would have made the connection between the imagination of the monster and the birth of her child, who also becomes a monster. H. Vélez-Quiñones affirms, "it

[35] See Huet, especially Part I. This belief was common in the Renaissance, but it was not a new belief; the idea of monstrous birth caused by the imagination or pondering of certain images has existed since bibilical times.

is Faustina's awful crime that gets displaced in the birth of Rosaura and consequently imprinted on her body" (66). The imagining of the monster before Rosaura's birth–who is also the sister that Faustina betrayed–causes Faustina's monstrous birth, which is also the visual manifestation of Faustina's monstrously disordered desires.

Holding the infant Rosaura in her arms on stage, Faustina refers to the baby as "traidor" and "desdichado," two traits the mother also displays. Faustina is unfortunate in that it was not her destiny to become Queen and so the heavens will not grant her an heir. Like her mother, Rosaura is also *desdichada*, stolen away from a life at the court by the monstrous Teodosia, who physically removes the baby from Faustina's arms while she lay unconscious. Faustina is a traitor because she betrays her sister and deceives the King; Rosaura, in a sense, is a traitor to her own mother. As Huet writes, "the monster [progeny] appears as the public display of all secret, and at times illegitimate, yearnings. There are no desires, shameful or innocent, that one's progeny does not publicly disclose" (17). By physically manifesting her mother's secret and illegitimate desires, or her moral monstrosity, Rosaura betrays her mother's outward guise of righteousness.

Rosaura displays her mother's sin and disorder through her hybrid nature. A mixture of noble lineage, inherited from her father, and moral impurity, inherited from her mother; animality and humanity; hideousness and beauty; ignorance and intelligence; violence and passivity, she embodies the disordered coupling of Faustina and King Primislao. Though she is born of a noble father, her mother's deception and treachery mean she is also an illegitimate child.[36] This blend of illegitimacy and nobility is echoed in her mixture of animal-like traits and

[36] In cases of monstrous births the mother could overcome the father's contribution during conception. Huet writes, "In the cases of monstrous births . . . particularly those caused by the power of the maternal imagination, the mother's role gained considerable importance. Just as

human ones. The stage directions tell us that as the second act opens, "Entra la reina Teodosia, de salvaje, y con las mismas pieles Rosaura, que es la niña que quitó a su hermana" (II, 434). Rosaura takes on the same dress as Teodosia, in animal skins that link her identity to the uncivilized animal realm. Teodosia affirms "que somos dos animales" (I, 434). In other words, she has acquired the same identity as her adoptive mother. However, as Rosaura begins to understand the difference between humans and animals, she begins to wonder if she is in fact human. Teodosia can only respond that her identity is defined by others: "Eres fiera en ser tratada/ como fiera … no eres tú mujer" (I, 434). Though Rosaura is human and female, she lives as an animal because others perceive her as an animal, calling her *bárbaro, animal, fiera, monstruo*, and *salvaje.*[37] Neither fully human nor fully animal, her character does not fit into binary categories. She is a reflection of the social and monarchical disorder her mother causes by unjustly killing the rightful Queen and usurping her place at the King's side.

Rosaura's appearance is another hybrid aspect of her nature. As Felipe discovers, a veil of monstrosity partially conceals her rare and extraordinary beauty. By chance, Rosaura meets Felipe, the illegitimate son of the Count of Barcelona's daughter and her husband, who married one another in secret. To save his family's honor, the Count demands that his men leave Felipe in the woods to be devoured by animals. Lauro finds him, and recognizing he must have noble heritage, brings him home to raise him. When Rosaura and Felipe encounter one another in the forest, Felipe is frightened by the sight of her, and considers running away. Realizing he has

---

monstrosities challenged the general laws of procreation, imagination challenged the respective roles of males and females in generation" (14). Although Rosaura's father is the king, Faustina's monstrosity can overcome his role in generation to create monstrous progeny.

[37] Examples include: "bárbaro" (II, 446); "fiera" (II, 436, 437, 444, 445, 446, 447; III, 450, 451, 453, 454, 457, 458, 459); "animal" (II, 440; III, 447, 450, 451, 457, 454, 458, 459); "monstruo" (II, 439, 441; III, 447, 451, 453, 454, 453, 460); and "salvaje" (II, 437, 443; III, 455).

nowhere to go but further into the wild alone with the monster, he decides to confront her instead. He exclaims, "¡Aquí estoy, monstruo cruel!" (II, 439). At first sight, Felipe moves away from Rosaura in fright, because she appears aesthetically monstrous. As the stage directions reveal at the beginning of Act II, Rosaura enters the stage dressed in the same skins and wild hair as Teodosia.[38] Consequently, at first glance Felipe initially concludes that she must be a monster.

However, as they move closer to one another, he begins to see her extraordinary beauty. Seeming to catch a glimpse of her loveliness as he approaches her, Felipe asks, "¿Quién eres, hermosa fiera,/ que acercándome a tu cara,/ la mano y la espada para?/ ¿Eres demonio o mujer?/ Que todo lo puede ser/ un hermosura tan rara" (II, 440). From what he can tell of Rosaura's beauty, it is so extraordinary that he is not sure if she is a demon or a woman. To find out, he tells her, "Desvía bien los cabellos,/ pues no vengo a hacerte daño;/ será el rostro desengaño/ de lo que temo por ellos" (II, 440). Felipe tells her to part her mane to reveal the beauty he suspects lies beneath. Only when she parts her hair can Felipe clearly see beyond her monstrous facade and notice her exceptional beauty. Noting the contradiction, he exclaims, "¡Oh, varia Naturaleza!/ ¡Que dieses tanta belleza/ a un monstruo!" (II, 441). The unkempt hair that covers her face is the monstrous mask that is the symbol of her mother's sin, hiding her own beauty, which is symbolic of her noble blood connection to the king. Her remarkable appearance is also noted later, when she goes to the palace. There, Faustina and Primislao comment on the unusual beauty that lies underneath her wild hair and skins, saying she is a "bello animal" and "monstruo de belleza" (447). Her two faces, the animal or monstrous face, and the human and beautiful one, are a reflection of her mother's sins and also the nobility she inherited from her royal father.

[38] The stage directions at the beginning of Act II state: "Entra la reina Teodosia, de salvaje, y con las mismas pieles Rosaura, que es la niña que quitó a su hermana" (II, 434). The unkempt hair is not only a typical part of the *salvaje* costume, but is also described by Felipe in his interactions with Rosaura.

When combined, these two sides of Rosaura's appearance and essence leave her on the monstrous margins of society.

Rosaura is also hybrid in her knowledge of the world: she is completely ignorant of the laws and norms of civilization, but also has a natural impulse and capacity to learn them. The former characeristic represents her mother's disobedience of the conventional social, political, and moral order in her immoral actions, while the latter characteristic represents Rosaura's inherent nobility, conferred to her by her father. For instance, she does not know that she should not embrace a man who is not her husband, nor declare aloud her love for him (II, 443-444); but she also has a natural curiosity to learn about the civilized world. She voices the contradiction she feels: "¿Quién podrá, madre, sufrir/ el deseo de saber?/ Cuando era niña pequeña/ bien tomaba sus liciones,/ sin pasar de aquella peña,/ conociendo las razones/ de que me advierte y enseña./ Ya grande, cual soy agora,/ no las tomo bien, señora,/ porque a su mucha aspereza/ mi propia naturaleza/ se rebela de hora en hora" (II, 434). Rosaura lives in the peripheral space between knowing and unknowing, between her inherently noble nature and her outward, animal-like monstrosity.

It is only when Rosaura meets Felipe that her potential to learn and become integrated into society is engaged, and she receives the education she needs to transform the barbaric, animal soul she inherited from her morally monstrous mother into a pure, human, Christian one.[39] When she first meets Felipe, she describes what she feels in terms of carnal love: "Yo vi, yo me admire; mas de admirarme/ nació un regalo en que sentí perderme;/ los sentidos hallé como el que duerme,/ sin poder la memoria despertarme" (II, 440). Felipe awakens in her many

[39] For more on the process of learning through Neoplatonic love in this play and generally in Lope's work, see Antonucci 90, Holloway, and Martín.

new, physical sensations she has never experienced before. In her beast-like state, Rosaura can only understand that she wants to fulfill these physical desires, just as her mother was driven by lust: "Huyo de la razón y el gusto sigo" she says (II, 440). Felipe affirms that Rosaura is ruled by carnal love when he reasons, "amor, y pasión natural,/ la debe de haber rendido" (II, 441). As the embodiment of her mother's sins of carnal desire, and as a beast-like monster isolated for years from civilization and society's norms, Rosaura's soul remains in a sinful state and she only knows how to express her desire in physical, animalistic terms.

Realizing that she only knows physical passion and knows nothing of how to love according to Christian norms, Felipe begins to teach her about them. For instance, he educates her on courtship rituals and gender norms. He explains that the man has to express love for the woman, and not just the woman for the man, because it's possible he loves another (II, 241). He also informs her that "el servir, el pretender,/ y el rogar es para el hombre," instructing Rosaura on conventional gender roles (II, 444). Felipe teaches her about virtues like modesty, or "vergüenza, porque conviene/ mucho a toda honesta dama," helping her to understand social norms regarding the body (II, 241).[40] Eager to understand more, she shares with Felipe that her "mother," Teodosia, told her "que soy mujer/ y que puedo con mi honor/ quererte como a marido" (II, 444). In other words, Teodosia has told her that if she is an honorable woman, she could be Felipe's wife. Felipe explains to her that Teodosia is right, and adds that love within marriage is the most perfect desire of all: "Es el más perfeto amor,/ y sin ofensa del Cielo,/ En todo dice verdad" (II, 244). In this exchange, he helps Rosaura to understand that Christian love is superior to her animal-like physical desire, and is manifested in the marriage between an

[40] Juan Luis Vives, in his *Instrucción de la mujer cristiana* (1524), says that the goal of the female education is a moral and Christian life. Virtue, especially the chastity of the woman either as a virgin, a widow, or a married woman, is the most important characteristic of the Christian woman. All other virtues emerge from living a chaste life.

honorable woman and the man who declares his love for her. Felipe thus awakens her understanding of Christian, spiritual love and shows her how to substitute her physical passion with a higher form of spiritual desire. Through Felipe's education, Rosaura's initial animalistic, carnal desire is re-directed and eventually substituted for a spiritual desire that will unite with her beloved in marriage and please God.

Soon after Felipe and Rosaura agree to marry one another, some *villanos* attack her and Felipe kills two of them while defending her. He is carried off to the palace for punishment, and Rosaura contemplates which action to take: to run back to the mountains or to go after him to save him. At the end of her monologue, she says, "La libertad quiero dalle/ que me dio en esta ocasión […] No digas, ni Dios lo quiera,/ que fui mujer en amarte;/ cobarde amigo, en dejarte,/ y en irme a los montes, fiera" (II, 446). She realizes she has a chance to free Felipe from prison just as he freed her from her "dura fiereza" (II, 445). She does not desire to be the monstrous mixture of woman, cowardly friend, and beast any longer; she chooses humanity and morality above the other identities, and leaves to save her beloved. In this scene she shows that she is aware of her new identity and the type of divine love and fidelity it requires her to display.

In Act III, Lope shows the audience that spiritual love has not only informed Rosaura's reasoning, but has also transformed her soul. In another monologue, she confirms that her soul now has spiritual, enlightened wisdom (*entendimiento*); memory (*memoria*); and will (*voluntad*): She says:

> Alma cubierta de esta vil corteza,
> ¿sientes por dicha? – ¿Ya no ves que siento?
> – ¿*Entiendes* bien? – En el entendimiento
> parezco celestial naturaleza.
> – ¿Tienes tú *voluntad*? – ¿En la belleza
> que adoro no lo ves y en mi tormento?
> – ¿Y *memoria*? – También, que en un momento,
> soy siempre volador en la presteza.

– Pues si quieres, entiendes y te acuerdas,
quieres con voluntad lo que has buscado
con el entendimiento y la memoria,
no pierdas la razón, por que no pierdas
las tres potencias con que Dios te ha dado
saber qué es bien y mal, qué es pena y gloria. (458, emphasis my own)

The three features of Rosaura's soul mentioned here are also St. Augustine's three features of the human soul: wisdom, will, and memory, which are one indication that she has become more human than animal.[41] At the end of her speech she adds that these features also allow her to recognize the difference between good and evil, suffering and glory, which means she has gained the sense of morality that her monstrous mother lacked. Able to distinguish between good and evil, Rosaura's soul can be saved. Thus, her new, Christian love for Felipe purifies the stain of her mother's immorality. Felipe's instruction, and Rosaura's understanding and expression of divine love, have purified her soul of the stain of her mother's sins, allowing her soul to become human and giving her a new identity as human and the potential for Christian salvation.

Since Rosaura's revelations are made while she is alone on stage, only the audience is aware of her spiritual transformation. The other characters, apart from Felipe and Teodosia, are not cognizant of her internal change. Consequently, when Rosaura goes to the palace to save Felipe, the people there continue to view her as a monster based on her appearance. Her desire to free her beloved is noble, but she only knows how to save him using methods she learned in the wild, so her passionate quest at the palace seems frightening to others.[42] Even though the

[41] *Entendimiento* here does not only refer to intellect or reasoning, but also to understanding enlightened by Christian spirituality, a contemplative, angelic state of wisdom or heavenly wisdom. See Holloway 251-254. On Augustine's three features of the soul, see his *De Trinitate* Chapters 10-11.

[42] As Martín says, Rosaura goes off "rushing to defend her beloved with the savageness she learned during her life in the wild" (187).

audience sees her actions as motivated by a pure and honorable love, to the other characters on stage her attempts to save Felipe appear violent and monstrous. For example, Rosaura "entra con un bastón" among a group of villanos and uses it to beat the men who have captured her love (II, 446). They shout in fear and carry her to the palace to be punished, as they did earlier with Felipe. There, they place her in chains, but she escapes to find Felipe. While the audience would judge her persistence as noble, the other characters at the palace are terrorized by her actions. They exclaim, "¡Guarda el fiero animal, guarda la fiera! […] Que el monstruo de Palacio se ha soltado,/ y dicen que a la cárcel se ha venido" and they discuss whether to tie her up or shoot her with an arrow (III, 454-455). In these scenes, Lope shows the inability of some people to recognize nobility through honor based on inner virtue, because they are obsessed instead with appearances or reputation. When Rosaura finally reaches Felipe, she tells him what she has witnessed at the palace, and describes at length the riches, privileges, and ceremonies there, as well as the pervasive envy among the nobles and dignitaries (III, 455).[43] Her spiritual salvation and the inability of the people at the palace to recognize her honor convey Lope's condemnation of the courtly envy of status and privilege, and its fixation on honor and social identity based on appearances and others' perceptions. The envy of rank and privilege is also personified in Rosaura's mother Faustina, who falsely accuses her sister of adultery in order to ascend socially and fulfill her carnal desires.

[43] Rosaura says, "Vi pasar vidas a prisa,/ siendo tan corto el espacio./ Vi reyes, supremo oficio/ de la justicia y gobierno./ Vi el diluvio y el infierno/ y vi el día del juicio:/ el diluvio en pretendientes/ anegados y quejosos;/ el infierno en ambiciosos/ de lugares eminentes./ El juicio en la estrañeza/ y multitud desigual/ como junta universal/ de nuestra naturaleza./ Vi riquezas en tropel/ con pequeño beneficio,/ y vi allí con artificio/ lo que en el campo sin él./ Lisonjas y adulaciones/ muy válidas conocí;/ y a las ceremonias vi/ con un libro de invenciones./ Vi grandeza en las coronas/ y vi, por una escalera/ que toda de vidrios era,/ subir y bajar personas./ Vi dignidades y cargos/ a quien la envidia se atreve;/ que para vida tan breve/ me parecieron muy largos…" (III, 455).

Even when the true identities of Teodosia, Rosaura, and Felipe are finally revealed at the end of the play, and Rosaura and Felipe are to be married, the king contines to express concerns about Rosaura's monstrosity; he cannot, of course, see past her appearance and the aggressive way she tried to save her beloved. The King says in the final scene, "para dar un reino a un monstruo,/ ha de haber mayores señas" (III, 460). To remedy the situation, Felipe takes Rosaura's hand, and says "te quiero hacer de mis brazos/ otra más fuerte cadena" (III, 460). The *cadena* of Felipe's arms symbolizes that within the bonds of marriage, and Felipe's pure love for her are the best means of instruction and control of all, because it not only orders behavior, but it purifies the soul and pleases God, as well.

Teodosia and Margarita, and Margarita's son Ursón, are also perceived as monsters by other characters throughout the plays. However, the audience knows that their monstrous outward appearance–or in Margarita's case, the image created of her through description–is merely the result of the identity loss they experience as innocent victims of deceitful nobles and a society obsessed with honor based on reputation. Even though these characters are not truly monsters and only look like monsters on stage, the contrast of their false monstrosity allows Lope to expose the error of basing one's judgements of a person's honor on appearances and reputation instead of an examination of his or her morality or inner virtue.

From the beginning of the play, Teodosia appears on stage looking the part of a monstrous character. Her appearance derives from the legen of the Monster of Buda. While F. Antonucci has studied Teodosia's character in depth as an example of the *mujer salvaje,* Río Parra explains that the origins of Teodosia's character are rooted in a different tradition, in the

image of a monster whose behavior and appearance are distinct from that of the *mujer salvaje*.[44] Río Parra argues that to create Teodosia's character, Lope appropriates the image and story of the Monster of Buda, who appears frequently in *pliegos sueltos* that circulated in Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In almost all the documents, the Monster is depicted as a long-legged, herbivorous monster with disproportionately large shoulders that seemed like a hump, and a long neck and prominent jaw ("Entre historia" 55). It ran fast, talked, lived in the Hungarian mountains and assaulted villagers for bread ("Entre historia" 56). One of these documents also mentions the monster was captured in Buda sometime during the wars between the Turks and the Hungarians, possibly between 1541-1686 ("Entre historia" 52-53). Using its speed and strength, it had been fighting for the Turks against the Christians when it was captured.

According to Río Parra, "Estamos ante la reapropriación de una imagen muy utilizada en siglos precedentes, que se presenta como novedad y rareza al público del siglo XVII" (55). First, Bartolo, one of the King's men, makes a clear reference to the aforementioned loose documents when he and other hunters discuss the monster (Teodosia) they are hunting. He says, "Ya su retrato anda impreso/ y se cantan cada día/ las colas de sus traiciones" (I, 427). In other words, he says her image has been circulating already, which may be the same documents that circulated

[44] Antonucci calls Teodosia and Ursón (Queen Margarita's monstrous son in *Ursón y Valentín*) *salvajes* because of their inherently human characteristics and says they relate to monsters only in their similar distance from the center of civilization. Mazur also argues that characters like Teodosia and Ursón are really *salvajes,* and the characters in the play mistakenly identify them as monsters. He says that these characters cannot be interpreted as monsters because "all *salvajes* undergo a restoration to their human status" as do Teodosia and Ursón (235). Río Parra (2003) and H. Vélez-Quiñones, on the other hand, insist because they are *perceived* as monsters, we must study them as such: "Although these *salvajes* are ultimately human, other characters perceive them as wild people and, thus, as monsters" (Vélez-Quiñones 43). He adds that Mazur "misses the point when he banishes the discourse of monstrosity from the textual interplay at work in the *comedias*" (43 Note 5).

about the Monster of Buda ("Entre historia" 56). Teodosia's appearance and rumored behavior closely resemble the monster as well. Other characters describe her as having the body of a giant, which reflects the monster's large neck and shoulders (I, 428). She lives as a monster in the Hungarian wilderness; she can run fast, and speak; and though she is rumored to kill animals and rape women, she really only goes in search of *pan* (I, 423). The Monster of Buda fought for the Turks against the Christians, associating it with the evil that Islam represented for the Christians in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. In a similar fashion, Teodosia is viewed as an evil enemy to the villagers because rumors of her attacks transform her into a threatening menace to the well being of the village. Her close relation to the well-known Monster of Buda means that Lope's audience would not have viewed her as a *mujer salvaje*, but as a monster.[45]

Teodosia would also been viewed as a monster because in early modern Spain, adultery was believed to make a wife like a monster. Fray Luis de León, in his work *La perfecta casada* (1583), writes that each woman should work hard to become perfect in her particular role, and a wife's actions diverge from her role, she is like a monster with parts from various animals:

[45] There are several other reasons why I believe we must study these characters as monsters and not just as *salvajes*, as Antonucci has. and why we should examine the significance of monstrosity in both *El animal de Hungría* and *Ursón y Valentín*. First, in *El animal*, the word *monstruo*, or variations of it, appears 19 times; *salvaje* appears only 6. In *Ursón y Valentín*, the word *monstruo* and its derivations appear 13 times; *salvaje* appears only 2. The greater prevalence of the vocabulary of monstrosity, I believe, points to its greater relevance to the characters and the action of the plays, as well as to their overall themes. Secondly, both the salvaje character and the evil courtesan are referred to as monsters; and in the end, it is true that the *salvaje* character does not turn out to be the true monster of the play (as we will see, it is the evil courtesan). However, the *salvaje* characters are still perceived as a monsters throughout the extent of both plays, and therefore I think the *monstruo/salvaje* character warrants examination as a monster, and not just as a wild man or woman. Thirdly, as I will demonstrate in this dissertation, I disagree with Antonucci that the *salvaje* in these plays is only monstrous in appearance. Fourth, while Antonucci argues that these characters must be considered *salvajes* because of their underlying humanity, I would argue that it is this very animal/human hybridity that is part of what makes them monstrous. Finally, I believe that Lope's references to these characters as monsters denotes a loss of identity and dehumanization that the *salvaje* label does not entirely encompass.

> Y como en la naturaleza los monstruos que nascen con partes y miembros de animales diferentes no se conservan ni viven, así esta monstruosidad de diferentes estados en un compuesto, el uno en la profesión y el otro en las obras, los que la siguen no se logran en sus intentos; y como la naturaleza aborrece los monstruos, así Dios huye déstos y los abomina. (17)

Like the monster with many parts cannot live and is abhorred by God, so the wife who commits adultery cannot live and is also shunned by God. She is to live in a way such that she pleases God and husband and serves them both, and part of this style of life means living chastely and also having the appearance of living chastely, which is just as important. If she fails, she is seen as a monstrous perversion or fragmentation of the role of wife. Luis de León adds that illicit behavior and deceit are monstrous qualities of the wife:

> Que, como a las aves les es naturaleza el volar, así las casadas han de tener por dote natural, en que no puede haber quiebra, el ser buenas y honestas, y han de estar persuadidas que lo contrario es suceso aborrescible y desventurado, y hecho monstruoso, o, por mejor decir, no han de imaginar que puede suceder lo contrario, más que ser el fuego fríio o la nieve caliente. (32)

Being honest and chaste are qualities so critical to the nature of the wife, that to behave otherwise is so offensive that it should never even enter the woman's mind. It is so horrible for a wife to be dishonest and unchaste that these characteristics were considered monstrosities, abominable and wretched. This popular work explains why Teodosia and Margarita's alleged actions as unfaithful wives cause them to be made into monsters.

Teodosia's monstrous appearance reflects the false that she committed the immoral act of adultery. The stage directions tell us that she enters the stage "vestida de pieles" (I, 422). When she meets Lauro, she "[d]escubre el rostro, apartando los cabellos," meaning that she enters the stage with hair covering her face (I, 422). Aurora Egido explains that from ancient times, animal skins and unkempt hair have had sinful connotations, especially in relation to sexual appetite and the diabolical ("El vestido" 40). For instance, the wild man in Diego de San Pedro's *Cárcel de*

amor (1492), "un cavallero assí feroz de presencia como espantosa de vista, cubierto todo de cabello a manera de salvaje," is identified with uncontrolled desire for beauty and passion that prevents the lover from regaining his moral independence (81).[46] Though nudity would have best represented the consciousness of original sin that Adam and Eve experienced in the Garden of Eden, animal skins and unruly hair were the best alternative for the stage, a sort of allegorical nudity ("El vestido" 43). Teodosia's skins and hair, like those of the wild man in *Cárcel*, demonstrate that the rest of society perceives her as dishonorable for being sexually impure, for having transgressive desire and an uninhibited sexual appetite.

Teodosia's monstrous appearance also makes her seem more animal than human, visually dehumanizing and marginalizing her character. The Lex Salica (55,2) declares that the banished person is chased away from collective human society, and while he is excluded from social bonds, he becomes almost a wolf, a man-wolf or a werewolf (Geremek 350).[47] This is what occurs with Teodosia: accused of adultery, she is banished to the wild to die, but is transformed into a kind of were-woman instead. The animal skins she wears affirm her connection to the animal realm. Under the influence of Aristotle, early modern people believed that animals, unlike humans, could not control their natural impulses and passions because they did not have reason or souls.[48] Teodosia's animal-like appearance signifies that others believe she has lost the ability to control her passions, is deficient in reason, and thus is unfit to live among humans. It visually dehumanizes her, denying her place in society and humanity. Through her monstrous state, Lope

[46] On the significance of the *hombre salvaje* in *Cárcel de Amor,* see Damiani and Deyermond.

[47] For more on the history and implications of the Lex Salica, see Drew.

[48] See Aristotle, especially Book II, for his explanations of the distinctions made between animals and humans, which persisted in the early modern period.

illustrates the marginalization from society and dehumanization that occurs in real life as a result of dishonor. He creates visual social distance between the perceived monster Teodosia and the rest of society to dramatize the rejection of impurity and the demand for immaculacy that Lope's audience also experienced in a society that fashioned social class and access to privilege based on having a reputation of purity of blood.

As in Lope's society, Teodosia's identity is contingent upon how others perceive her. She explains: "Fiera soy, pues que me envían/ a que entre ellas viva y muera" (I, 429). Because others see her as a beast, she becomes one. To others, she is *monstruo, animal, bestia, fiera,* and *salvaje*, and on stage she manifests those identities in her dress, behavior, and wild habitat.[49] Though Teodosia is still ultimately human, she loses control over her own identity. She lives in the wild as a monster because she must in order to survive; she knows if anyone found out she were alive she would surely be killed. However, she also lives as an animal-like monster because the way others see her becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. The truth of her innocence cannot repair her reputation as an adulterer, and so her identity is determined by other's opinion. The way in which her monstrous identity is formed by other's perceptions of her dishonor, inhumanity, and animality speaks to the concerns of Lope's audience about the importance of image and reputation to social identity. Like for the monster Teodosia, Spaniards experienced social death and identity transformation because of dishonor, and even for the mere accusation of dishonor. Teodosia's transformation from noblewoman to monster dramatizes the critical importance of honor, or social reputation, to social identity in early modern Spain.

[49] For example, Teodosia is described in the following terms: "monstruo" (I, 422, 429, 430); "animal" (I, 426, 428; III, 450); "bestia" (I, 427); "fiera" (I, 427, 430; II, 436, 437); "salvaje" (II, 437, 443); half-human, half-animal (I, 428).

Because Teodosia is perceived as monstrous but is really innocent, she embodies a mixture that threatens and breaks conventional categories, a characteristic of monsters. She is believed to be immoral and must be punished accordingly, but the allegations against her are false. She exists as the living dead, simultaneously deceased to the human, civilized world, and yet alive in the bestial realm. She explains, "Volvieron a Primislao/ diciéndole que era muerta;/ pero mirando los Cielos/ mi desdicha y mi inocencia,/ permitieron que a mis pies,/ mansas y humildes las fieras,/ me halagasen y me diesen/ consuelo entre tantas penas" (I, 423). Assumed guilty and dead in the human realm, the heavens allow her to be re-born as a monster in the animal one because she is innocent. In her involuntary monstrosity, she thus lives between two worlds, innocent and immaculate, but displaced to the realm of the animal, denied access to human society and yet not fully animal.

Teodosia is also at once hideous and beautiful; underneath her animal skins and disheveled hair, she displays a "rara belleza" that symbolizes her nobility and morality (I, 423). Noticing the contrast in her beauty and hideousness, Lauro exclaims in disbelief, "¿Es posible que ha criado/ la varia Naturaleza/ en este monte nevado/ tal rostro en tanta fiereza?" (I, 423). Only those characters who are able to inspect her closely can see the ambiguity of her identity, simultaneously beast-like and beautiful. Teodosia's monstrous outward appearance represents how others see her, as impure and dishonored; and her beauty symbolizes how God sees her, as morally pure and honorable.

Her double identity, as a seemingly immoral monster and as a virtuous woman, makes her behavior equally complex. On the one hand, she is aggressive, assaulting villagers for food; but on the other hand she is sometimes passive, denying herself the opportunity to take revenge on her sister because it is incompatible with her nobility: "Pero si me han hecho fiera/ fiereza

podré tener; pero no, que soy mujer/ y he de ser lo que antes era" (I, 430). In other words, she is human and woman, "Teodosia, del rey esposa,/ santa, honesta y adorada de Hungría" (I, 428) but she has also a been deformed by the accusations against her and made into "el animal/ espanto de toda Hungría" (I, 428). Teodosia embodies two extreme identities: she is the rightful, virtuous queen of Hungary, and also its most feared monster. As Cohen writes, monsters, by nature, defy categorization:

> This refusal to participate in the classificatory 'order or things' is true of monsters generally: they are disturbing hybrids whose externally incoherent bodies resist attempts to include them in any systematic structuration. And so the monster is dangerous, a form suspended between forms that threatens to smash distinctions. Because of its ontological liminality, the monster notoriously appears at times of crisis as a kind of third term that problematizes the clash of extremes. ("Monster Theory" 6)

Teodosia's hybridism resists the categorization. Her incarnation of monstrous extremes–virtuous but assumed guilty, alive and dead, beautiful and hideous, passive and aggressive, human and monster–prevents her from fitting neatly into any of society's conventional binary categories. She embodies the disorder that Lope finds in her being pereceived as a monster, and the injustice done to her by the real monster of the play, the morally monstrous Faustina.

Teodosia's disordered hybridism dramatizes a clash of extremes, between honor as reputation and honor as inherent virtue. As Wardropper says, "Lope de Vega's work shows the honor code in a moment of crisis" (81). This moment of crisis is the irreconcilability of the two codes, honor based on appearances and reputation versus honor as individual virtue; the former based on the judgment of man, and the latter on the judgment of God (Wardropper 82). According to the paradigm of honor as individual virtue, she is honorable and human. Faustina admits she stole Teodosia's "casto honor," indicating she was indeed chaste and honorable (III, 447). As pure and virtuous, she belongs in the powerful and privileged social position of queen. However, seen from the notion of honor as social reputation, Teodosia is dishonorable and a

monster. Faustina falsely accuses her, saying, "Teodosia fué una traidora/ al Rey, al Cielo y al suelo" (III, 451). In spite of the fact Faustina's claims are false, the mere suspicion causes Teodosia's dishonor. She is unworthy of membership in society and is banished to the barbaric margins. The truth of her honor and the falsity of her dishonor leave her in an ambiguous state that rejects the binary of honor/dishonor and means she is utterly displaced in the world. She does not belong in either humanity or in the animal realm, and the result is a state of monstrous hybridity and marginality. Teodosia's monstrosity dramatizes the crisis of conflicting honor codes.

As the representative of uncontrolled sexual appetite, she causes fear and anxiety in others because she poses a threat of impurity and dishonor to others. Selvagio and Bartolo, two *alcaldes*, recount one example of her threat and the fear it generates: "Si no es que el miedo/ las ha obligado a mentir/ más de seis decirte puedo" (I, 428). The women who have been attacked by Teodosia are afraid to tell their story. In the comedia, women are the vessel of honor; and so when she infiltrates the village and is said to rape their women, she jeopardizes their loss of purity and honor and also that of their male counterparts. The villagers cannot protect themselves against her attacks, because, as Bartolo admits, they are insufficiently armed: "Está muy pobre el lugar/ de rocines y lanzones," (I, 427). The imagery of few horses and spears symbolizes a masculine impotency to defend female immaculacy. The fear others have of Teodosia's monstrosity is demonstrative of their fear of contamination, subsequent dishonor, and loss of social identity.

Unable to restrain or detain the monster, the villagers' fate and honor are in the hands of another, which brings us to a second source of fear: a lack of control. Selvagio and Bartolo explain the threat she poses to their livelihood as they beg the king for help: "Hasnos de ayudar

ahora/ para matar una fiera/ que nuesos campos devora, […] Es un animal que anida/ en este monte, tan fuerte,/ que nos roba la comida./ Y como le des la muerte,/ darásnos, señor, la vida" (I, 427). Teodosia consumes both their territory and their sustenance, threatening the existence of the village and the lives of its people. They beg the king for help and hunting parties go in search of her because they want to regain power over their own fate, over their own purity, and their own honor. However, Teodosia is never captured, and only reenters the dominant order when she reveals her true identity at the end of the play. The fear Teodosia causes finds its articulation in reality in the lack of control early modern Spaniards had over their own social reputations and identities. Her uncontrollable menace signifies the constant threat of dishonor for early modern Spaniards, who like the characters in the play, grasped mostly in vain for control over the "monster" of dishonor, over potential stains on their social reputations and social fates.

Cervantes also dramatizes the early modern Spanish anxiety over honor as the reputation in his *Retablo de las maravillas*. In this play, the deceitful Chirinos and Chanfalla put on a show, a magical *Retablo*, that the latter explains can only be seen if one is an Old Christian; is the product of a legitimate union; and has pure blood. Otherwise, one will not be able to see the play. Believing him, the entire town, including the Mayor and the Governor, begin to lie about how they can see events that are non-existent on stage, going to great lengths to make sure no one thinks they have impure blood. When an officer arrives and admits he sees nothing, the play ends in a chaotic fight as the townspeople jump on him and claim he must be a Jew. Cervantes' play displays the apprehension around honor as blood purity and *opinión*, because one had to be careful about everything one said and did to maintain a reputation of purity.

McKendrick writes that this anxiety created a sort of identity crisis for early modern Spaniards: "the possibility of social disgrace was an ever-present spectre that haunted all but the

inviolate minority. The noble . . . was condemned to a life of eternal vigilance over something which he himself exercised little control, to a life, in other words, that was a permanent crisis of social identity" (*Identities* 32). Lope's audience would have recognized their own anxieties in the obsession of the villagers with eliminating the Animal de Hungría once and for all, because they, too, had to carefully keep vigil over their honor to prevent it from attacks and contamination. The obsession with Teodosia's threat and attempts to mitigate it echo the defining power of honor as reputation in Lope's own society and the concerns it created. Teodosia's experience as monster and the reactions of those around her are Lope's dramatic interpretation of the experiences and apprehension of all Spaniards, whose honor and social identity were determined solely by the *opinión* of others.

Margarita, like Teodosia, is also imagined as a monster because of her alleged immorality in the form of adultery. When Uberto tells King Clodoveo that she has committed adultery, the King exclaims that she is a traitor, animal-like and monstrous: "¡Oh Margarita, más digna/ de echar a los animales/ que de mis bienes reales;/ no precie la más indigna/ de las que no fueron tales!/ ¡Oh falsa leona brava!/ ¡Oh traidora, infame esclava!/ ¡Oh vil y bajo ser!/ ¡Oh ingrata, aleve mujer!" (I, 190). The *Diccionario de Autoridades* says the *león* is an "[a]nimal ferocíssimo, y mui generoso y de noble condición, por lo qual es tenido y reputado por Rey de todos los brutos" (385). In other words, the qualities that make the lion the king of all the animals, and the symbol of royalty, are its generosity, nobility, and ferocity. By calling Margarita a *falsa leona brava*, the king points out that what makes her abominable is that she is the opposite of the generous, noble, and brave lion. She is the representative of falsity or deception, and the embodiment of greed, impurity, and dishonor. Since the lion represents royalty, by calling her a

falsa leona the king also conveys that Margarita's alleged sexual impurity makes her nobility a sham, meaning she is not fit to serve as queen.

The King also refers to her as a "deshonesta, sucia arpía" (1, 192). In the Aeneid, harpies are described as fierce monsters sent as human punishment, "[w]ith virgin faces, but with wombs obscene,/ Foul paunches, and with ordure still unclean; With claws for hands, and looks for ever lean" (Book III). Covarrubias echoes this repugnant vision of the harpy by describing them as:

> unas aves monstruosas, con el rostro de doncellas y lo demás de aves de rapiña, crueles, sucias y asquerosas[…] Las harpías son símbolo de los usurpadores de haciendas ajenas, de los que las arruinan y maltratan, de las rameras que despedezan un hombre, glotoneándole su hacienda y robándosela. (1027)

By referring to Margarita as a harpy, the King imagines her as a dehumanized monster, with the face of a woman and the body of a bird of prey, filthy and disgusting. She is described in this way because though she is a woman, her alleged sexual impurity makes her unclean and repulsive. The harpy is also a symbol of the usurper, who forcefully and greedily seizes what is not rightfully his; and of the *ramera*, or prostitute, who destroys men and greedily robs them of their possessions. Margarita seems to be both of these: in her suspected sexual deviance she has relations with bodies that do not belong rightfully pertain to her; and her alleged promiscuity jeapordizes the king's pure lineage and continued possession of the throne. In her monstrosity, she fragments her own honor, as well as the king's.

Although Margarita does not physically display the monstrosity the king ascribes to her, the King's words paint a verbal picture of her impurity and social marginalization for Lope's audience. As I. Arellano argues, the visual nature of theater imbues visual value into the words spoken by the characters on stage (*Convención y recepción* 200). He writes, "La mirada del espectador de teatro es un a mirada discriminadora, selectiva. Y es precisamente el texto en gran parte el que desempeña la función orientadora e interpretadora de lo visual que debe ser

percibido como componente activo del espacio escéncio" (204-205). In other words, the words spoken on stage orient the audience as to how to interpret what they see on stage. By designating Margarita as a monstrous mixture of human and animal and the repulsive harpy, Lope informs the audience that while she may seem noble on the outside, her dishonor means that others, including the audience, should see her as monstrously Other.

While Margarita does not display outward signs monstrosity, her son Ursón visually manifests her alleged dishonor. José Antonio Madrigal writes that her sons Ursón and Valentín "pueden constituir un símbolo dicótomo de su madre"; while the civilized and educated Valentín represents her true innocence and inherent nobility, the monstrous Ursón is the visual manifestation of his mothers' alleged immorality and dishonor (212).[50] The infant Ursón is physically carried away from his mother by a character dressed as a female bear. The stage directions read, "Sale una osa con un niño en los brazos, y Luciano tras ella con una espada desnuda" (I, 204). In this scene, Lope shows Ursón's human mother being replaced by an animal one, and Ursón physically leaves the realm of civilization and enters the bear cave. Ursón's movement across the stage in the arms of the bear links him to the animal realm and visually marginalizes him from the rest of society and civilization. Luciano later recounts that he found Ursón "envuelto/ entre pieles de animales," a costume that also aesthetically connects him to animals and a lack of civilizing codes for sexuality (II, 219). Luciano names him Ursón, after the bear, which combines the Latin *ursus*, or bear, with the Spanish augmentative suffix *–ón*. Ursón's name thus signifies large size or excess, and embodies his mother's alleged excess and deviant desire. In alchemy, the bear corresponds to the *nigredo* of prime matter, and so it is related to all initial stages and initial instincts (Cirlot 356). Ursón is carried away to be raised by

[50] Ursón is, in a sense, a kind of monstrous birth. For more on the idea of monstrous birth, see Huet and Wilson.

a bear from the time of his birth, so he does not learn the civilizing codes of society and lives by his instincts and appetite, as an animal does. Once he is grown, to fulfill his appetite for food, drink, and women, he kills men, steals bread and wine, and attacks villagers for their food (II, 220-225). These primitive and excessive instincts remind the audience of Margarita's suspected fulfilling of her own illicit instincts outside of marriage. Ursón's bear-like nature dehumanizes him and marginalizes him, displaying his dishonored mother's loss of identity.

Like Teodosia, Ursón is a monstrous mixture of animal, monster, and human. On the one hand, as he grows, other characters perceive him as a bear, a demon, and a monster. Other characters exclaim on various occasions, "¡Guarda el oso!"; they refer to him as "Señor oso, diablo o brujo,/ espinrizo salvaje" (II, 227); and call him *animal, monstruo, bestia* and *salvaje.*[51] On the other hand, although Ursón lives as an animal-like monster, his appetites become increasingly human–for instance, as the play continues he desires more palatable food and seems to be humanized by his feelings for the *villana*–though he can only fulfill them through violent, animal-like means because he lacks the knowledge of civilizing codes that would enable him to do otherwise. He exhibits both monstrous and human characteristics because although he visually manifests his mother's alleged impurity, he is also inherently innocent and noble like her. Like the monstrously hybrid Teodosia, in his outward monstrosity and inner innocence, Ursón displays discord between honor as social reputation and honor as personal virtue.

Ursón embodies social and political disorder because by living as a monster he disrupts the legitimate line of monarchical inheritance. The King tries to protect his honor and the legitimacy of his monarchy by sentencing Margarita to death, but his rightful heirs are banished

[51] For example: "animal" (II, 229); "monstruo" (II, 228, 234, 238, 239; III, 259, 261, 267, 268); bestia (II, 233; III, 261); and salvaje (III, 267).

as well. Since ancient times, adultery on the part of the female entangled questions of inheritance in the event of children and elicited concerns about potential contamination of the bloodline.[52] King Clodoveo rejects Margarita's plea to spare his unborn child (which, unknown to him, is actually twins) because he says the child could inherit the mother's vices and destroy him: "No ha de quedar prenda tuya/ que me herede y me destruya/ con los vicios que tuviere" (I, 194). The King is concerned that Margarita's impurity could be passed on to her child, putting the King and the monarchy at risk for destruction. However, in an effort to protect the integrity of the monarchy, the King actually destroys it by exiling the innocent Queen and the legitimate future sovereign in her womb. Ursón's monstrosity is a way for Lope to represent the potential social and political disorder that can be caused by society's obsession with identity defined by reputation alone.

Ursón's long lost twin brother, Valentín, is the character who is finally able to bring the "monster" Ursón under control and restore order to the kingdom. Valentín finds Ursón while he is out hunting with the King's men. Realizing he is only a monster in his frightening appearance– "Sólo en el miedo es monstruo,/ que en lo demás, no lo creo"–Valentín brings him to the court where their identities as sons of the King and Queen are revealed (III, 260). With Margarita's name already cleared during Uberto's confession of guilt before he died, Ursón can be welcomed into civilization and the nobility because he no longer represents dishonor and abjection. The revelation of Margarita's innocence, and of Valentín's and Ursón's royal ties, restores order to

[52] See F. Engels, who discusses the history of the family structure and the effects of the notion of private property had on that structure and on women's sexual rights within what became monogamous marriages. For more on the topic of adultery specifically in the early modern period, see M. Wiesner-Hanks; on adultery in Spain during this time period, see G. Dopico Black. On the evolution of the ideas of sexuality in Christianity, see P. Brown.

the monarchy, because it places the legitimate queen and heir at the throne; and to the social hierarchy, because Margarita and her sons can re-enter the familial structure.

The "monsters" Teodosia, Magarita, and Urson make these plays more interesting by creating dramatic tension and intrigue, but they also communicate important messages about Lope's views on blind faith in honor based on reputation alone. These innocent victims that become monsters in *El animal de Hungría* and *Nacimiento de Ursón y Valentín* contribute to the dramatization of the complexity of social self-fashioning based on honor as reputation and honor as inner virtue. On the one hand, these plays are a dramatic representation of the reality that *opinión* is the principal defining factor of individual and social identity. King Primislao says, "Teodosia con gran razón/ es muerta; y si el vulgo vario/ ha pensado lo contrario,/ yo tengo satisfación/ de la justicia que tuve" (III, 451). The accusations by Faustina, coupled with other evidence that supported her claim, seem to be a convincing incrimination of Teodosia, and they require punishment. Similarly, Lope represents this unfortunate reality in *Ursón y Valentín*, in which Margarita is punished based on accusations of infidelity. The King knows he must obey the laws of honor, but he laments having to kill his beloved: "Amor, ríndete, ¡por Dios!,/ que ha de vencer el honor./ Quisiera, siendo possible,/ dulce amor, que tú vencieras,/ pero el honor es terrible,/ y hame mandado que muera,/ puesto que fuera imposible" (I, 199). Honor is the supreme force that determines the life or death of the suspected adulterer and must be obeyed. However, the King also acknowledges that honor is a terrible force, whose rigidity is incompatible with love.

For Lope, honor based on appearances, suspicions, and reputation is incompatible with Christian morality. He is critical of the how the kings judge their queens honor, blindly following the accusations of the moral monsters without verifying their veracity. By relying solely on

appearances, they commit grave errors that convert innocent people into monsters. Lope challenges the dominant convention of honor as *opinión* by revealing that Teodosia, Margarita, and Ursón appear to be monstrous but are really innocent, and by identifying the real monsters of the plays as Faustina and Uberto. Faustina and Uberto also demonstrate the importance of Christian virtue to social identity. Lope conveys that the real danger to social order is dishonor in the form of monstrous immorality, and that *opinión* alone is not a faithful test of social identity because appearances are not always what they seem. Accusations of dishonor must be verified to ensure that pure, moral, innocent people are not unjustly stripped of their social identities.

Honor itself is embodied in these characters as a two-faced monster. One face is that of honor as social reputation: the worldly, temporal version of honor based on racial purity or the reputation of racial purity, determined by others and not the self. In the theater, this type of honor is represented by sexually pure female characters. This face of honor is embodied in Teodosia and Margarita, whose dishonor is the result of a reputation sullied by false accusations of adultery made against them. The other face of honor is that of honor as inner morality, the Christian or spirtual notion of honor that derives from the chivalric ideals of loyalty and courage (Wardropper 82-83, McKendrick 16). It is honor defined by the self, what Calderón called the "patrimonio del alma," (*El alcalde de Zalamea* I, vv. 871-876). This face is incarnated in Faustina's and Uberto's moral monstrosity that is driven by sin. Together, these monstrous characters represent the two faces of (dis)honor: the external, *el qué dirán* and the internal, personal virtue.

These plays are not the only ones in which Lope treats the contrast between the two conceptions of honor throughout this dramatic production. For example, he writes in *Los comendadores de Córdoba* (1596): "Honra es aquélla que consiste en otro;/ ningún hombre es

honrado por sí mismo;/ que del otro recibe la honra un hombre;/ ser virtuoso hombre y tener méritos,/ no es ser honrado; pero dar las causas/ para que los que traten les den honra" (III, 290). Here, he compares the force of honor as defined by others versus inner morality, insisting that honor is given by others and is not inherently possessed. However, as C.A. Jones writes, "this honour, however useful as a dramatic motive, was not entirely satisfactory to Lope" ("Honor in *El alcalde*" 193). We see his other view of honor, for instance, in his auto sacramental *La locura por la honra* (1618), where he writes, "las honras del mundo/ son viento, son polvo y nada,/ y sólo hay honra de Dios" (637). Here, worldy honor is insignificant when compared to honor as virtue or spiritual honor. This is the view Lope conveys in *El animal de Hungría* and *Ursón y Valentín*. Through manifestations of monstrosity, he criticizes a society infatuated with honor as reputation that often victimizes the innocent, and argues in favor of the notion of honor as the patrimony of the soul, as inherent virtue. In Lope's society, honor as morality could not stand up to suspicions of impurity, and these two plays show that he saw sin and immorality, or dishonor as defined by God, as more dangerous to social order than man's concern with honor as reputation.

The monstrous character is an appropriate vehicle for representing this juxtaposition of honor as *opinión* and honor as personal virtue. As Cohen explains, the monstrous "arises at the point of tension in these classification systems where mutually exclusive categories grind against each other in their too-tight and restrictive fit" ("The Order of Monsters" 43). With honor, this point of tension is the friction between incompatible doctrines of honor as external reputation and honor as internal nature. The two faces of doctrine are evidently opposed, but the difficulty

"was that, in the popular mind, both codes of behavior were axiomatic" (Wardropper 82).[53] Lope's depiction of each kind of dishonor in monstrous characters illustrates the tension between these two paradigms, the two conflicting paths to social identity, and the incompatibility of the monster of honor as reputation with Christianity.

Lope's monsters also embody the early modern Spanish experience with honor as a defining force of identity. The dehumanized monster characters show the loss of identity and social marginalization of dishonor. The fear and anxiety that the monsters cause represents the fear and anxiety that early modern Spanish people felt over the precarious nature of their honor, social identity and privilege because it was out of their control. McKendrick, writing on the relationship between honor as female chastity in the theater and honor as purity of blood in real life, discusses the similarity between the "obsessional energies" of the two topics (19). The theater was obsessed with female sexual purity, while real-life Spaniards were obsessed with *limpieza de sangre*. She dubs the similarities between the two obsessions the "intuitive translation of obsessional energy from one area of experience to another, a process of mimetic transference" (19). Like McKendrick, I do not intend to argue that Lope purposefully replaced the obsession with honor as social reputation in real life with obsession and anxiety over the control of the monster on his stage. What we see in these two plays is, to borrow from McKendrick, the mimetic transference of the psychopathology of Lope's time. It is the dramatic representation of the real anxiety people felt regarding identity determined by honor, or one's social privilege determined by *el qué dirán*.

[53] A. G. Valdecasas notes that this concern between worldy paradigms of honor and Christian ones was not exclusive to the Renaissance, or to Spain in particular. What made Spain's case unique was the intensity of the contrast, and the pervasiveness of the theme in its literature. He writes, "El conflicto entre los preceptos de la moral cristiana y la moral propia de la sociedad no es exclusivo de ninguna época. Lo singular era la intensidad con que ambos principios morales se vivían, y que dió ocasión a que tantas veces el contraste se señalara en la literatura" (217).

Through interactions between the monsters and other characters in the plays, Lope dramatizes the encounters that shape the process of self-definition through honor. Castro affirms that honor in early modern Spanish drama reveals how Spanish people contrasted themselves against one another to define themselves, individually and as a social class:

> Por tan hondo motivo, el 'honor' en el drama del siglo XVII no es un simple tema literario... Es, sí, expresión de realidad profunda, de la inquietud española por el valer de su persona frente a otras personas, de la creencia constitutiva de su valer personal, afirmada en roces, ajustes y pugnas con otras creencias rivales. (139)

Using monsters to serve as a contrast to acceptable conventions, Lope defines immoral people as the true monsters and the real threat to social order. The monsters are a way for him to reveal his vision of the ideal Spanish social self-fashioning: based on honor as Christian morality. Through the incorporation of different kinds of monsters, he shows the contradictions and flaws in the paradigm of honor as reputation that people use to define social difference.

Finally, Lope's true monsters, Faustina and Uberto, are driven by the same sinful desires with which all human beings struggle: carnal love, envy, and a desire for power and privilege. They serve as signs of the human battle between the morally monstrous and the virtuous; between natural instinct and moral codes; selfishness and magnanimity; dishonor and honor; carnal love and divine love; evil versus good. His dramatic interpretation of honor through monstrosity is, on a broader scale, an examination of human frailty to sin. As Miñana has written, writers like Lope and Gracián remind us that "todos somos monstruos con dos caras, pues el mundo se aprehende sólo mediante una combinación equilibrada entre los extremos, y que nos corresponde escoger, desde nuestra intrínseca monstruosidad, entre el bien y el mal, lo apropiado y lo inapropiado" (21). Lope's audience would have been repulsed by Faustina and Uberto's monstrous immorality, but would also have recognized their own moral struggles in the

characters' moral downfalls. Monstrosity in these plays signifies dishonor, the loss of social identity, and also the universal human struggle with the monster within all of us: sin.

Sin and virtue also play a factor in the monstrosity and identity of the tyrant kings in Lope's *El gran duque de Moscovia* and *Roma abrasada y crueldades de Nerón*, which are examined in Chapter II.

Chapter II

Monstrosity and Tyranny in *Roma abrasada y crueldades de Nerón* and *El gran duque de Moscovia*

In recent decades, scholars have contested the long-held belief that Lope's plays are monolithic in their reproduction of official ideology, arguing they are more multi-dimensional than originally thought. Throughout much of the 20th century, scholars who studied Lope's political plays argued that he was a conformist who promoted an official political ideology in which the king "is the greatest embodiment of civil authority, the creator and giver of all honor, and the maximum representative of social order" (Lauer, *Tyrannicide* 1). For example, A. Castro (1916) insists on the moral carte blanche of the king in the *comedia*. The nobility cannot rebel against the king when he breaks the honor code, because the king is the foundation on which the entire honor system is built. In other words, the king cannot be punished because without him, there is no honor attached to nobility, and in fact the nobility would cease to exist (34). Castro bases this argument upon the idea of the king as the representative of God's in the physical world, whose political authority derives from God's divine authority. Like God, then, the King is above moral reproach.

L. Pfandl and K. Vossler follow in Castro's footsteps and uphold the idea of Lope's monarchic absolutism and utter obedience of the Spanish vassal to the king. Menéndez Pidal (1940) also agrees that an offended vassal cannot kill a royal offender. In the 1940s to 1960s, J.A. Maravall maintains this interpretation of the *comedia,* asserting that although no moralist or

political theorist ever supported an absolute monarchy, the theater exalts absolutism.[54] A. Alfaro and R. A. Young defend this stand. Young says only God has the right to punish the king. Alfaro argues that the king is not always depicted favorably, but reaffirms Maravall's position by saying: "En la comedia no se considera nunca tirano el rey. Aun en los casos de honor, el vasallo no puede levanter armas contra un monarca." (138). Again, we see an insistence that in Lope's *comedia,* kings are above reproach.

However, Lope's declared purpose for writing *comedias* suggests we should not interpret his king plays so narrowly. In *El Arte nuevo de hacer comedias* (1609), Lope declares his theater to be entertainment above all else, because it is the public who pays: "…escribo por el arte que inventaron/ los que el vulgar aplauso pretendieron/ porque como las paga el vulgo, es justo/ hablarle en necio para darle gusto" (vv. 45-48). The *comedia*'s purpose, first and foremost, is to please the audience. But Lope does not fill the *corrales* by regurgitating official, dominant ideology only; rather, he says, "Ya tiene la comedia verdadera/ su fin propuesto como todo género/ de poema o poesis, y este ha sido/ imitar las acciones de los hombres,/ y pintar de aquel siglo las costumbres" (vv. 49-53). To entertain the public, Lope seeks to interpret the everyday lives of his audience. He writes about contemporary events, issues, and traditions to interest a diverse public. This means Lope was not only writing for the king and the most privileged noble classes and their ideologies; he was also writing for those people who may have disagreed or have been oppressed or disgruntled by those official dogmas and conventions.

Lope's declared intent to please by writing about issues pertinent to his audience may have contributed to the interpretation recently made by revisionist scholars like C. Stern, A.R. Lauer (1987), M. McKendrick (2000), and E. García Santo-Tomás (2000), who begin to see the

[54] See Maravall's view of the *comedia* in his works from 1944, 1969, and 1975.

comedias about kings in a new, more complex light. They argue that playwrights of this time period were not conscious propagandists of an aristocratic élite. Rather, they insist that the theater of this time was a medium by which playwrights, like Lope de Vega, explored a range of political concerns and ideologies in his time. For instance, Stern rejects a Machiavellian reading of Lope's *comedias*; Lauer demonstrates there are numerous examples of tyrant kings in the theater who are removed from power by natural law or moral or political grounds; Santo-Tomás sees plays like *Fuenteovejuna* not as propaganda for absolutism, but as spaces for debate on contemporary political issues; and McKendrick shows us that Lope often subverts official political order to criticize kings who misuse or abuse their power. In sum, these more recent interpretations of Lope's king plays see them as a national institution, but also as the artistic dramatization of the debates, conflicts and complexities of the early modern Spanish political reality.[55] Approaching Lope's *comedias* from this revisionist point of view, and never forgetting Lope's primary purpose is to entertain, this chapter examines how Lope creates monstrously tyrannical kings in *Roma abrasada y crueldades de Nerón* and *El gran duque de Moscovia* to dramatize concerns about the monarchy that were relevant to his early modern Spanish audience.

In early modern Europe, monstrosity and politics are connected in various ways.[56] One way is through the notion of monstrous races. By imparting elements of the monstrous to national characteristics, early modern people were better able to define their own national identities and delimit cultural differences. A second connection between monstrosity and politics is the idea of the body politic. Grotesque or monstruos bodies were believed to reflect

[55] For studies on Lope's treatment of a variety of topics about the monarchy, see for example Gómez-Moriana, Exum, Young, L. Rodríguez, Lauer (1987), and McKendrick (2000).

[56] See L.L. Knoppers and J.B. Landes for a series of articles that discuss the various ways in which monstrosity is connected to the political realm, including monstrous races and the body politic, from the medieval period through the 19th century.

deformities or aberrations of the body politic. For instance, if the king was corrupt, then the body politic became a headless body, fragmented and thus monstrously deformed. A third connection between monstrosity and politics in this time period is through medical theories, such as those by the Spanish physician Huarte de San Juan. In his work *Examen de los ingenios para las ciencias* (1594), Huarte finds relationships between physiology, psychology, and eugenics. For him, each person's particular internal mix of humors and qualities determined their appearance, behavior, virtue, intellect, and his most suitable profession. For instance, he writes that the person most fit to be king has to have a mild temperament, and an equal proportion of the three faculties of intellect, memory, and wisdom. The humors and qualities of the body could deform not only a person's physical appearance, but also his or her spiritual and intellectual characteristics. Huarte's prescrition for the temperament of the ideal king was a way to ensure the monarch would be physically, morally, and intellectually able to successfully perform the duties of the office.

Roma abrasada opens with Claudio as emperor, who condemns his adulterous wife Mesalina to death and then marries his niece, Agripina.[57] Claudio's only living son, Germánico, is unfit to be heir so Claudio arranges the marriage of his daughter, Otavia, to Agripina's son, Nerón, so that he can inherit the throne. Nerón and Agripina plot Claudio's death so he can take his place as emperor. Nerón fatally poisons Claudio, and ascends to the throne. Initially, he is

[57] Ruser establishes that Lope's dramatization of the life of Nero was largely informed by Pedro Mexia's *Historia imperial y cesárea* (1552), which recounts the life of Nero from his childhood, to his transformation into a cruel tyrant, to his death. According to Menéndez Pelayo (1949), he was also influenced by the immensely popular *romance* "Mira Nero de Tarpeya," which describes the burning of Rome and parts of which appear in the third act of the play. The images of Nero as a cruel tyrant and the incendiary of Rome often appeared in other works of sixteenthand seventeenth century literature and were well-known to sixteenth and seventeenth century Spaniards (Bluher 238). For example, the *romance* is mentioned in both *La Celestina* (1499) and *Don Quijote de la Mancha* (1605, 1615).

prudent, merciful, and measured. However, after five years, he morphs into a depraved tyrant: he murders his brother, his mother, and his wife; he kills five thousand Christians and nearly just as many gentiles; he orders the death of his royal advisors Palante and Séneca; he sets fire to Rome and watches it burn without remorse; and he kills his second wife, Popea, while she is pregnant with their unborn child. However, when he finds out the senators are pursuing him to kill him, he commits suicide. The play ends with Nerón replaced with one of the generals, Galba, who is unanimously elected by the senators.

At first, Lope illustrates Nerón as an ideal future emperor by representing his various virtues, which are lauded by various other characters. For example, when Nerón lets others speak before he does at the palace, Félix and Palante exclaim, "¡Qué humildad!" and "¡Qué hidalgas muestras/ de valor y discreción!" (I, 220). The men of the court marvel at Nerón's virtues of humility, courage, and good judgment. Nerón also demonstrates restraint and clemency and when he pardons Dardanio, the brother of a rebel, saying, "Tu prisión parece exceso/ en la piedad que procuro" (II, 240). In this scene, Nerón chooses mercy over vengeance, and Séneca praises him by saying, "¡Qué hazaña tan valerosa!" (II, 241). Nerón is brave to be so merciful with an enemy, and his inclination for mercy over retribution also makes him a praiseworthy ruler. In a third example, Nerón displays the virtue of compassion when he must sign a death sentence. Trembling, he exclaims he wishes he didn't know how to write so he could avoid committing "un acto tan inhumano" (II, 243). Nerón says he killing his fellow man, even in the name of justice, as an inhuman act, showing his high regard for human life. In this scene, Séneca extols him for saying such words: "palabra noble y benigna,/ palabra santa y piadosa" (II, 243). Nerón is the picture of righteousness, benevolence, and moral virtue in his affection for his fellow man, which Séneca praises because they are qualities that make an effective ruler. A

humble, courageous, prudent, restrained, merciful, and benevolent man, Nerón displays a wide range of virtues that seem to have prepared him to be the ideal new emperor of Rome.

In the seventeenth century, some political philosophers believed the king should be a virtuous one above all else, whom Fernández-Santamaría refers to as ethicists. This camp of philosophers praised these virtues in a monarch.[58] For instance, B. Gracián writes in his work *El político don Fernando el Católico* (1640) that King Ferdinand was the perfect prince because of his Christian virtues. Ferdinand was: "católico, valeroso, magnánimo, político, prudente, sabio, amado, justiciero, feliz y universal héroe" (218). Lope's audience would have seen Nerón's initial virtues in the first act, similar to those of the beloved King Ferdinand, as indicators that he had the potential to be a good and just emperor, even though the story of Nerón's spiral into tyranny was well known.

Nerón also demonstrates his suitability for becoming emperor when he shows the ability to prioritize reason above all else when necessary. When Agripina expresses horror that the emperor Claudio has killed his wife because she allegedly committed adultery, Nerón defends Claudio, saying, "Debiólo de merecer./ ¿Para qué os espantáis tanto/ donde hay razón y poder?" (I, 221). For Nerón, Claudio must be trusted to use power coupled with reason to make just decisions in the best interest of his office and the empire.

Seventeenth-century political philosophers known as realists conveyed the importance of reason to monarchical rule. They believed the king must be virtuous, but also practical and

[58] The ethicists believed that politics should be subordinate to morals and exalted the Christian prince over the prince well versed in political teachings. The idealists, like the ethicists, desired a moral king, while also idealizing the Spanish monarchy above all others. The realists had a more pragmatic, though still Christian, interpretation of politics. One sub-group of the realists, the *arbitristas*, prioritized practical solutions to real problems over the morality or moral training of the king. Finally, the *tacitistas*, a second a sub-group of realists, accepted a Machiavellian realism of politics, but tried to reconcile that political realism with moral virtue (Fernández-Santamaría 1-3).

protect the state at all costs. For instance, J.P. Máritir Rizo argues in *Vida de Rómulo* (1633) that Christian virtue is secondary in importance to ensuring political stability and the conservation of the state. He writes the king must do what is necessary, even if it goes against Christian principles, to protect the life of his kingdom. For example, he praises Rómulo for killing his brother, Remo, for crossing the walls Rómulo had forbidden anyone to breach: "con esto sosegó sus cuidados y puso la primera piedra del fundamento de su fortuna, que obedece a los varones prudentes." Rizo insists that what seems to be an ethically atrocious act is actually a prudent political act that will build good fortune, because it protects the state. Lope's audience would agree that while the prince should be virtuous, he cannot take unnecessary risks because he must protect his subjects and the integrity of the kingdom above all else.

Finally, Nerón's education from the famous teacher, Séneca, is another characteristic that makes him seem to be the perfect future emperor. From the play we learn that Nerón has been instructed in Greek, Latin, other liberal arts, music and battle skills, and how to live virtuously by Séneca. The positive effects of his training are noticeable and desirable; Palante compliments him by saying, "Bien se os luce el buen maestro" (I, 220). Séneca's virtuous teachings guide Nerón's behavior, and other characters commend the positive effect they have had on the young man. The ethicists especially saw a proper education as a key characteristic of the ideal king. For example, Gracián mentions that part of what made Fernando successful is that he was not only born from a long line of virtuous men, "selectos, politicos, sagaces, belicosos y prudentes"; but that these virtues were refined and reinforced through education and training. He writes, "De una heroica educación sale un heroico rey" (24-25, 26-27). Without an education, the king cannot properly develop and refine the virtues he has inherited. In *Roma abrasada*, Lope echoes this

sentiment by highlighting Nerón's training with Séneca as part of what makes him an ideal leader to the court and subjects of Rome.

The words of Otón summarize the particular qualities that make Nerón seem worthy of inheriting the throne:

> Que las partes de Nerón,/ su ingenio, su entendimiento,/ su cordura y discreción,/ son evidente argumento/ de su afable condición./ Y al fin, un hombre enseñado/ por un sabio el más versado/ en moral filosofía/ que conocen este día/ griego y romano Senado,/ no puede ser que no sea/ el que tan alto lugar/ más dignamente posea. (I, 232)

Up to this point in the play, Nerón's virtues, together with his reason and his excellent education, seem to have created in him the perfect man to eventually replace Claudio as emperor. Lope's ideal depiction of Nerón in the first act reflects the different early modern Spanish ideologies around what characteristics comprise the ideal monarch.

However, the emperor quickly transforms into a morally monstrous and violent tyrant. By depicting Nerón as a monster, Lope is able to instruct the audience and the king about the undesirable qualities of a ruler. In the *dedicatoria* to *Roma abrasada*, he says that the purpose of the play is to contrast the government of the Roman consuls with that of Felipe IV. He writes that he will tell the story of the

> *Tragedia de Roma*, no en su grandeza y suma felicidad…sino abrasada, aunque Roma, a los pies de un tirano, la cabeza del mundo, para que se vea lo imposible de la proporción en la infinita distancia…doy un laurel indigno: Al honor de nuestros magistraados, el pervertido gobierno de aquellos cónsules…A la reputación de nuestras armas, las consulares insignias desatadas y las águilas de plata teñidas del ocio. Y el más sangriento perseguidor de la Romana Iglesia a quien tanto ha celebrado la católica monarquía de Felipe IV…" (207-208)

Lope explains that a comparison of the lives of the two rulers will reveal the vast differences between one empire and the other. However, as Artigas writes, "cuando se compara la Roma abrasada con la España imperial las similitudes son mayores que las diferencias. Parecería como si Lope se hubiera deseado mostrar que la sociead de su época estaba tan 'abrasada' como la

Roma de los Césares" (47).[59] In other words, Lope creates Nerón as a monster of the Roman Empire in order to perhaps subtly instruct Felipe IV on how *not* to rule the Spanish Empire.

We see the beginnings of Nerón's tranformation into a moral monster when he rejects his virtuous leadership style upon learning from Otón that though he has been a revered and beloved ruler, his compassionate method of rule has weakened his authority. Otón says, "[b]ueno es que seas humano;/ pero dasle tanta mano/ a tu madre, que es muy cierto/ que en Roma y en Asia ha muerto/ a Narcisco y Silano" (II, 245). Because Nerón was extremely compassionate, and gave his mother a great deal of power, two innocent men are killed without his knowledge. Otón says Nerón's *humanidad*–which we can interpret as his human state and as his compassionate nature–have made him a vulnerable and ineffective ruler.[60] Nerón sees he must change his style of rule since the old, virtuous ways are making him weak politically. But rather than balance his compassion with discipline to protect his authority and the kingdom, Nerón abandons his humanity and benevolence completely and turns to vice and cruelty. He says, "[y]a sé que tanta bondad/ me alaba y se vitupera./ De hoy más seré diferente;/ que cinco años he vivido/ recogido injustamente,/ por no llegar a mi oído/ que era mi madre insolente./ Esta noche salgo fuera./ Voyme a armar" (II, 245). From this point forward, Nerón leaves his righteous sovereignty, humanity, and virtues behind and begins an immoral and violent reign of terror. Rather than

[59] Artigas provides an in-depth study of the similarities between the themes of honor versus corrupt consuls, the reputation of Spanish military strength in contrast to that of the Romans, and the king as the protector of Christianity in contrast to the bloody religious persecutors in the reigns of the Roman Ceasars. Artigas connects the play to the flaws of Felipe II in particular, and also references El Duque de Lerma, privado of Felipe III, as a possible target of criticism. Lope, she argues, was concerned that some of these political leaders' flaws were appearing in the reign of Felipe IV as well.

[60] In Covarrubias' *Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española*, "humano" is defined as: "aquello que puede pertenecer al hombre. Linage humano, todos los descendientes de Adam [. . .] el que es apacible, compasible, acariciador, benigno, y manso [. . .] se contrapone a divino" (1078).

restore integrity to his rule through virtue and the knowledge gained from Séneca's teachings, as the ethicists would have suggested, or balance his compassion with reason and practicality, as the realists would have recommended, Nerón chooses to over-compensate for his political weakness by divesting himself of virtue and becoming an immoral tyrant.

In his dramatic transformation, Nerón replaces each of his previously demonstrated desirable qualities–virtues, reason, and a good education–with vices. For example, Otavia says he hardly spends time with Séneca, comes and goes at all hours, and always seems agitated, showing Nerón no longer values the education and training that had prepared him so well for the throne (II, 246). When Fenicio comments on Nerón's erratic behavior, Nerón exclaims, "[p]ues aún ahora soy trueno,/ Todo aquesto ha sido ensayo/ de mi furia y valentía" (II, 249). Nerón warns this is only the thunder before the lighting; in other words, just the visual sign of the beginning of his rage and indiscretion. Thus, Lope shows Nerón has lost the virtues of compassion and reason.

Nerón has replaced several other virtues with vices, as well. For instance, Nerón displays a loss of restraint when he speaks without "la blandura/ que suele el Emperador" (II, 249). When he suggests killing a group of innocent singers on the street, Fenicio asks, "¿Si es justicia?" revealing Nerón no longer has a sense of justice (II, 254). Otón informs Nerón that the people of Rome are afraid and disturbed by his new behavior, which shows Nerón is no longer beloved by his people (II, 261). When Nerón sends Otón to Spain in order to gain access to Popea, Otón asks, "¿Estas son/ mercedes? ¿Esta es privanza?" indicating Nerón has lost clemency, discretion, and wisdom (II, 262).

Nerón shows his pride and arrogance when he proclaims, "¿Quién me puede gobernar,/ que a cielo ni tierra temo?" (II, 263). Nerón's enmity grows as he exclaims he wants to be feared

by everyone, even the heavens: "Tiemble mi madre y Otavia,/ tiemble el mundo, tiemble el cielo" (II, 263). The absence of fear of God would have been seen as a grave offense for a ruler in Lope's time. Seventeenth-century political theorist Fray Pedro de Rivadeneyra writes in his *Tratado del príncipe cristiano* that kings "están obligados, como reyes, á amar y temer á Dios sobre todas las cosas y tener más cuenta con el culto y reverencia que se le debe que con todo lo demás" (474). The king, more than anyone else, is obligated to love and fear God. Rivadeneyra justifies this statement with several reasons, one of which is "por el daño que hace el rey á la república cuando no teme ni sirve á Dios como debe" (475). He explains that as the shepherd of the people, the king has many obligations, including a great responsibility lead them and protect them from danger. However, he says, a king cannot do this job well if he does not have the grace of God to support him. If the obligations of the king are greater than those of his subjects, then why, Rivadeneyra asks, should the king not be more obligated than anyone regarding "¿…amor y temor de Dios y el celo de la religión?" (475). Nerón's lack of fear of God would have been seen as not only a blasphemous to the One who bestowed him with power, but also as dangerous to the safety of his kingdom. Without God, he cannot protect his people from harm.

However, Nerón's goal is no longer to create peace in his kingdom and protect it, but to create enemies out of his own mother, his wife, his subjects, and even the gods, and to destroy it. Fulgencio summarizes Nerón's vices: he displays "soberbia, arrogancia, crueldad y ira,/ venganza, enemistad, odio y mentira" (III, 273). Pride, arrogance, cruelty, rage, vengeance, enmity, hatred and deception have replaced the virtues of humility, courage, compassion, restraint, wisdom, discretion, and justice. Coupled with his fearlessness of the heavens, Lope depicts Nerón as deficient in the qualities required to be an ideal ruler, and defiant of his obligations as protector of his kingdom.

Nerón's very name connotes monstrosity as well. In Corominas' *Diccionario etimológico*, the first entry for the word "Mero" reads, "pez acantopterigio que llega a un metro de largo, en cat. *nero*, prov. Mero(n); de origen incierto, acaso alteración del cat. *nero* íd. […] que parece ser aplicación figurada de *Nero* 'Nerón' por la voracidad y crueldad que se atribuye a este pez de boca y tamaño enormes" (54). The etymology of this type of fish potentially derives from Nerón's name because of its large mouth, enormous size, and its voracity and cruelty. This definition tells us that Nerón had been long associated with monstrosity for his cruel and voracious appetite for destruction, to the point where his name even becomes associated with a fish with a monstrous appetite and appearance in the early seventeenth century. The connection to Nerón's immorality and his monstrosity would have been apparent to Lope's early modern Spanish audience.

Lope describes Nerón as a monster because his lack of virtues and disproportionate accumulation of vices dehumanizes him and prevents him from becoming an ideal emperor.[61] After going on a vice-ridden rampage through town, Nerón exclaims: "Este día/ soy monstruo y furia infernal," (II, 269). Nerón had all of the ingredients necessary to become a perfect emperor: virtues, education and reason. However, in this scene he describes himself as a monster, because his *defecto* of virtue and order and his *sobra* of vice and disorder have prevented him from achieving perfection, from becoming the ideal emperor. The *Diccionario de autoridades* defines *monstruo* as a being that "por defecto o sobra, no adquiere la perfección que el viviente había de tener" (598). The definition of *monstruosidad* in the *Diccionario* affirms that monstrosity

[61] Nerón was also depicted in a monstrous fashion in Italian theater, in which "Castrati were assigned parts of powerful men, such as Nero, but they were represented as emasculated, lustful tyrants" (Finucci 236). The Castrati were normally never cast as kings because it didn't seem right to associate a king with a feminized man. While some scholars believe Nero was portrayed by a castrato because the high voice denoted a lack of virility and authority, others argue that the soprano voice actually signified supreme power, power that was "higher" than all the others.

denotes excessive immorality. Monstrosity is "suma fealdad ù desproporicón, en lo physico ù en lo moral (599). In other words, the word *monstruo* signifies not just imbalance, but grave moral disproportion. By describing Nerón as *monstruo,* Lope conveys that Nerón's lack of virtues and extreme excess of vices make him unfit to rule his empire.

Lope's also refers to Nerón as a *furia infernal* to convey Nerón is an unsuitable ruler because of his vengeful nature. The furies are goddesses of the underworld, figures of terror and vengeance (Ferber 189). They had a frightening appearance, "with writing snakes for hair and eyes that wept tears of blood" (Hamilton 67). Their office was to pursue and punish sinners, both on earth and in the underworld.[62] By referring to Nerón as a fury, Lope shows he has become preoccupied with punishment and reigning with terror. Nerón harasses and punishes his subjects freely and indiscriminately, causing them to fear and loathe him. These qualities make Nerón more worthy of ruling the underworld than of leading the Roman Empire. Nerón's depiction as a monster and a vengeful fury signify that his immorality and his vengeful nature prevent him from exploiting the desirable qualities he displayed in the first act, making him unfit to rule. Together, the terms *monstruo* and *furia infernal,* coupled with Nerón's violent and sinful behavior on stage, paint a verbal and visual picture of the emperor as a dangerously dehumanized monster. Since the monster is the representative of what society rejects and abhors, these aspects of Nerón's character reveal what Lope deemed as undesirable characteristics of the ideal prince.

Lope's focus on the emperor's desirable qualities of various virtues and a sense of justice would have been relevant to his early modern Spanish audience.[63] At the end of the sixteenth

[62] For more on the significance and history of the furies, see Virgil and Hamilton.

[63] For more on the political reality and culture of sixteenth and seventeenth century Spain, see J.H. Elliot (1963, 1986, 1989), and Lynch.

century, Carlos V had left Spain with an unwieldy, excessively large empire. Felipe II, an austere king who appointed himself defender of the Catholic faith, ruled in a Europe wrought by religious schism and under continual threat by Islam. He also oversaw the beginning of Spain's spiral into economic decline. Felipe III chose to hand over power to his favorite minister, the Duque de Lerma, who effectively governed for him. This series of troubled kings brought concerns about the nature of monarchical rule and the character of the ideal monarch to the forefront of the Spanish imagination.[64] Some political theorists, the realists, followed Machiavelli and insisted that though virtue was essential for the role of prince, it was not enough; the prince also needed political acumen and skill. Ironically, the *privanza* system highlighted the reality that monarchs did not necessarily make the best rulers and was a way to preserve the idea of an exemplary, Christian king as the ideal by separating the practical part of kingship from the personal. However, the Counter-Reformation rejected this notion and returned the emphasis to the personal worth of the monarch, maintaining that political considerations must be secondary to Christian virtues and principles. This stance was supported by the ethicists. In Europe, the ideal of the Christian prince had stubborn staying power, but eventually, even in Spain, Christian virtue was forced to yield to the concerns created by political realities. We can see the shift from Rivadeneyra's idea, that the king's example is more effective than laws (1595); to Saavedra Fajardo's insistence that the ideal prince is the *político-cristiano* (1640).

[64] A series of treatises on the monarchy demonstrate the substantial concern with the formation of the prince and the nature of the monarchy: Pedro de Rivadeneyra, *Tratado del príncipe cristiano* (1595); Juan de Mariana, *De Rege et Regis Institutione* (1599), Francisco de Quevedo, *Política de Dios y gobierno de Cristo* (1625); Juan Pablo Mártir Rizo, *Norte de príncipes* (1626), Diego Gurrea, *Arte de enseñar hijos de príncipes y señores* (1627), Mateo López Bravo, *De rege et regendi ratione* (1627), Jerónimo Fernández de Otero, *El maestro del príncipe* (1633), P. Andrés Mendo, *Príncipe perfeto y ministros ajustados* (1662), and Saavedra Fajardo, *Idea de un príncipe político-cristiano* (1640).

Thus, the monstrous figure of Nerón speaks to Spanish concerns about the morality of the king. Gracián, an ethicist, wrote that morality was a key characteristic of the ideal king. The only king worse than one without virtue, he said, was a king with an excess of vices. Gracián writes that "mayores monstruosidades hay," than an ineffective king; the worst thing a prince can do is "llenar […] el vacío de las virtudes de abominables vicios" (77). In other words, in early modern Spain the monstrous king is the one who, above all other flaws, replaces his virtues with vices. This is how Lope depicts Nerón's spiral into monstrosity: initially a virtuous and well-educated monarch, he replaces each one of this virtues with a vice. He becomes the picture of monarchical abjection, the deprave, inadequate, and unacceptable king.

With his new, inwardly immoral nature, Nerón's external behavior also becomes inhuman and disordered. J. de Rivilla de Bonet y Pueyo's *Desvíos de la naturaleza o tratado de el origen de los monstrous* (published 1695) reminds us that a monstrous interior leads to monstrous behavior. He writes, "el pecado hace a los hombre monstruos interiores, más terribles que los mismos monstruos, dependiendo estos de accidente, y aquellos de las costumbres" (Chapter 5, 39r). In other words, a monstrous interior produces a monstrous exterior; interior sin produces exterior sin. Lope does not depict Nerón as a monster only because of his vices, but because of the excessively cruel way he satisfies them.

The chain of Nerón's cruel acts is long and horrific. First, he kills his mother Agripina, Mario, and Palante without just cause; then he rejects Otavia and marries Popea on the same day he murders his mother, showing his indifference to her death; next, he brutally kills thousands of Christians–some are eaten alive by animals–and serves some of their bodies at a meal for their families; even Séneca, who helped raise and educate Nerón, is not immune to his cruelty and is next to be killed; after that, Nerón murders Otavia after falsely accusing her of adultery, just so

he can marry his latest love interest, Popea; but he doesn't stop there, setting fire to all of Rome and happily watching it burn from his castle. In his final cruel act, Nerón kills Popea even though she is pregnant with his unborn son.

The deaths of Agripina and Popea are the only ones acted out on stage–the others are carried off stage to die–and both women die by a sword through their abdomens. Agripina informs us before her death at the hands of Nerón's men, "Que la primera herida/ me deis en este vientre, que éste ha sido/ causa de que Nerón saliese al mundo; y la segunda en este pecho, en éste,/ que alguna vez le dio su leche y sangre […] Pues ya muero,/ contenta en que lo pague quien lo debe" (II, 271). Popea is killed by Nerón himself, who is not dissuaded by her exclamation, "¡Mira que preñada estoy!" (III, 299). We know Nerón kills Popea through her womb because Niceto cries, "¿Cómo en el vientre le has dado?" As Nerón's mother and wife, these two women are the vessels of Nerón's origins and his future progeny, respectively. The wounds inflicted on their wombs fragment and mutilate their bodies at the location where Nerón gestated in his mother, next to the chest that gave him blood and milk; and the place where his child with Popea was forming, that would have been his heir. The method of their murders destroys the place of origin of a past monstrous gestation and birth, and also a potential future one. Agripina requests to die this way to punish her body for having produced and nutured a cruel monster. The mutilation of Popea's womb on stage dramatizes the inability of Nerón's monstrosity, in its violence and disorder, to continue past his generation. It shows that the monstrous tyrant's excessive cruelty destroys his own lineage. With these scenes Lope conveys that in addition to bringing present monstrous tyrants under control, the creation of future monstrous tyrants must also be halted.

The burning of Rome, Nerón's most famously monstrous act, is another of Nerón's monstrous behaviors that is depicted on stage. The stage directions read, "Con trompetas y cajas se descubra Roma ardiendo, y en una/ torre Nerón y Popea, Niceto y Fenicio, cantando con sus instrumentos" (III, 293-294). The four characters sing a song that Lope derives from the *romance* "Mira Nero de Tarpeya." They sing four stanzas, the first of which is an exact replica of the first four verses of the *romance*: "Mira Nero de Tarpeya/ a Roma cómo se ardía;/ gritos dan niños y viejos,/ y él de nada se dolía" (II, 294).[65] This stanza in particular highlights Nerón's lack of emotion when confronted by the burning, destruction, and suffering of his own city. The second, third, and fourth stanza's are Lope's re-writing of other sections of the *romance*, but still follow it closely. They recount how Nerón burned Rome as if he were a vengeful representative of Troy; that Popea sings from the tower with a lyre while she observes the burning of Rome; and that for seven days and nights the city burns, consuming its riches and taking many lives, respectively. Each stanza is punctuated with a refrain of Lope's invention, "*¡Qué alegre vista!"* which may have been inspired by the following verses of the romance: "por la crueldad de Nero/ que lo ve: y toma alegría/… de ver abrasar a Roma/ gran deleyte recibia" (393-394).[66] The representation of Rome burning on stage, with Nerón and others singing gaily from the tower including a refrain about the happiness they feel while watching the destruction, depicts Nerón's inhuman reaction to the most monstrous act an emperor can commit: the willfull destruction of his own empire.

[65] These verses also appear in *La Celestina*. Calisto has returned from being rejected by Melibea, and asks Sempronio to sing the saddest song he can think of. Sempronio sings these four verses, and then the two characters discuss how the burning fire of Rome is related to the metaphorical burning, that cannot be contained, within Calisto for Melibea.

[66] See E. B. Kelley 122.

Political treatises produced in the early seventeenth century emphasize that a good king should defend and serve the interests of his kingdom. For instance, Rivadeneyra writes, "el rey es como el piloto del navío; y así como cuando un marinero particular yerra, hace poco daña al navío, mas cuando el piloto rige mal el timon, corre peligro de hundirse…mas cuando el rey [es ruin], da al traste con todo el reino y hunde el nevío de la república" (475). For him, the king is like the captain of the ship, responsible for the kingdom's fate; if the king errs, he destroys the entire kingdom. Therefore, he must act in such a way as to guide it carefully and protect it. Forty-five years later, Saavedra Fajardo writes that for the king, "la necesidad obliga a cuidar del pueblo, estimar la nobleza, premiar la virtud, honrar el valor, guardar la justica, y respetar la religion" (233). In other words, the prince was principally obligated to take care of his own people and rule virtuously and morally, with nobility, courage, justice, and according to Christian religious morals. When Nerón destroys his own city on stage, the audience would have connected his violent behavior to his moral monstrosity, as a king who rejected the very essence of what they saw as the king's moral obligation, to protect, guide, and serve the kingdom.

As Nerón's actions spiral out of control, other characters identify him as *monstruo, inhumano, bárbaro fiero/a, tirano, demonio*, and *vil sangriento* to denote his immoral excess; dehumanization; animal-like lack of control, compassion or reason; his absolute and cruel rule; and his evil nature.[67] For example, Fulgencio exclaims, "¡Qué en estos años que Roma falto/ ha crecido… la dureza/ de aqueste monstruo!" (III, 273). As Nerón becomes increasingly ambitious for power and hardened to injustice and suffering, his violent behavior intensifies. In another example, Otavia exclaims that all of Rome is "sujeta a un bárbaro fiero," (III, 290). The word

[67] References to Nerón as a monster include: "monstruo" (II, 265, 269; III, 273, 286, 293, 297), "inhumano" (II, 259), "(bárbaro) fiero/a" (III, 289, 290), "tirano (cruel)" (II, 272 and III, 295, 296, 301, 303), "demonio" (III, 277), and "vil sangriento" (III, 303).

bárbaro, in addition to connoting violence and cruelty, also conjures the notion of deficiency in Christian virtue and a primitivism that has been unenlightened by social, religious, or political mores. Otavia uses the world *fiero* because Nerón's vices have dehumanized him. His lack of compassion, remorse, and sense of justice makes him seem more beast-like than human.

The images Lope uses to describe Nerón's behavior communicate that his actions have become as monstrous and unbalanced as his excessive vices. Killing his family, his advisors, and his subjects without just cause, and solely out of a desire for vengeance and increased power, Nerón's behavior grossly offends social and political order. He commits these extremely cruel and violent acts not to preserve his empire, but to destroy it. Lope shows that without virtue, a king's political pragmatism easily falls prey to his vices, making him unfit in virtue or in political skill to be emperor.

Lope also uses Nerón's monstrosity to discuss the role of free and divine will in a king's success. On the one hand, Nerón fulfills his destiny. Séneca's astrologer predicts that he will murder his mother if he becomes emperor, and he does. On the other hand, Nerón also kills Séneca, which the astrologer did not predict; nor did he predict the deaths of the rest of Nerón's family, court, advisors, thousands of Christians, or the burning of Rome. Nerón's monstrosity is not his destiny, but his own willful choice. Nerón declares he will be *diferente* after learning of his political weakness in the second act, but *diferente* does not mean achieving balance between virtue and political strength; rather, it means Nerón chooses vice and political ruin. Even though other characters criticize his actions as cruel, unjust, unproductive, destructive, and inhuman, Nerón ignores them. Séneca even warns him, "Mira que vas acabando/ el mundo; tu furia mide;/ que vas al cielo enojando" (III, 286). Rather than finding a way to better protect his state, he destroys it. Nerón's monstrous vices and behavior are angering the heavens, but he continues to

choose evil and annihilation over humanity and justice. By dramatizing Nerón's fall into monstrous tyranny through free will, Lope makes a statement about the role of destiny and free will in a king's failure or success. A bad king, represented by the monster Nerón, willfully chooses vice and sinful behavior to satisfy his own desires at the expense of the state. A good king, in contrast, willfully chooses virtues and actions that ensure it will survive and flourish.

In *Roma abrasada*, Nerón's transformation from promising monarch to monster tells us that choosing vices–including arrogance, cruelty, rage, vengeance, enmity, hatred and deception–over virtues dehumanizes and disorders the king's nature, priorities, and actions, making him unsuitable to rule. Lope shows that the prince who is born with virtue, receiving a proper education, and having good judgment will not automatically and passively become a virtuous and effective king – not even through destiny alone. Rather, the prince must use his free will to continually choose virtue over vice; sound reason and justice over haste and injustice; and protecting and serving the needs of the kingdom over its deterioration and destruction. Some kings are virtuous, but not very adept political leaders; but the *mayor monstruosidad*, as Gracián says, is the king who of his own volition chooses to serve himself and his sins over his empire.

Similarly, Lope includes manifestations of monstrosity in *El gran duque de Moscovia* to dramatize what he sees as undesirable qualities in a sovereign ruler. In this play, Basilio, the Great Prince of Muscovy, kills his son Juan in an outburst of anger and then also dies the same day.[68] Teodoro, Basilio's other son, is unfit to rule because Juan's envious *privados* poisoned

[68] This play by Lope was the first attempt of a Western European playwright to adapt Russian history for theater. The origins of the play lie in the Demetrius Legend, which comes from the period of Russian history known as the Time of Troubles (1598-1613). Possible sources from which Lope obtained the news of this story include Barezzo Barezzi's *Relación de la señalada y como milagrosa conquista del paterno imperio conseguida del serenísimo príncipe Juan Demetrio, gran duque de Moscovia,* published in Italian in 1605 and translated to Spanish by Juan Mosquera in 1606; and the fourth part of Luis de Bavía's *Historia pontifical y católica*,

him with herbs that made him lose his mind; so Cristina, Teodoro's wife, appoints her brother Boris to govern until her and Teodoro's son Demetrio is of age. Boris, the new governor, does not want to give up his power and decides to kill the young Demetrio to ensure the life of his reign. However, Lamberto, Demetrio's tutor, and Rufino, Lamberto's servant, thwart the attempt by sacrificing César, Lamberto's son, and Demetrio escapes. Later Demetrio and Rufino enter a monastery, but flee when Boris discovers Demetrio there. While hiding from Boris and the rest of the kingdom, Demetrio and Rufino work as peasants in Livonia and become servants for the Count-Palatine. Finally, Demetrio decides it's time to reveal his identity and re-take his kingdom. With the help of Sigismundo, the king of Poland, Demetrio challenges Boris, who dies by his own hand on the battlefield. Demetrio marries the Count-Palatine's daughter Margarita and takes his rightful place at the throne.

In this play, Lope uses morally monstrous characters to discuss a king's capacity to rule and the legitimate line of inheritance of the throne. The first monstrous character is Basilio. At the beginning of the play, Basilio attempts to identify his son, Teodoro, as a monster because he has lost his mind after surviving a poisoning and is incapable of inheriting the throne. However, Teodoro is not a monster, but merely the unfortunate victim of Juan's "envidiosos y privados*"* (II, 211). What Basilio describes here is actually own moral monstrosity:

> Monstruo de naturaleza,/ hijo en mal punto engendrado,/ indigno de la grandeza/ de mi generoso estado;/ vil, fabulosa cabeza,/ a la que miraba igual/ aquel astuto animal/ que de verla se espantaba,/ viendo que sin seso estaba/ la belleza natural;/ hombre falto y ignorante,/ rudo y villano, grosero,/ a una estatua semejante,/ más que los bárbaros fiero/ que están en el mar Adlante…" (I, 203)

Basilio calls Teodoro a "monstruo de naturleza" because he has a despicable and extraordinary

---

published 1613. For a discussion of these and other possible sources, see Brody Chapter 2, 54-78.

(in a negative sense) mind and lacks any reason. However, immediately after this rant, Teodoro says, "Señor, tú tienes pasión./ Todo te parece mal…/ Pues cierto que soy discreto,/ y que dicen por ahí/ que sé más que tú" (I, 204). Teodoro might not be completely lucid, as demonstrated in his comically ignorant comments throughout the first act; but Basilio's lack of reason is connected to his uncontrolled passions, which make him view everything negatively and act violently. In other words, the "vil, fabulosa cabeza…sin seso" that Basilio describes is his own, as he lacks the ability to mediate his emotions with good sense.

Basilio claims Teodoro is "hombre falto y ingorante" because he misunderstands some things; but Basilio is really the "hombre falto y ignorante" because he lacks the restraint and wisdom needed to rule well. To Basilio, Teodoro seems "rudo y villano, grosero,/ a una estatua semejante" because in his insanity he does not have the refinement of his other son, and he is useless as an heir to the throne. However, Basilio is the one whose behavior is crude, violent, and brutish, lacking in compassion as if he were little more than a statue. Teodoro might prove to be unintelligent at times, providing some comic relief in contrast to Basilio's violent behavior; for example, he confuses the concepts of *parir* and *engendrar* (I, 207). However, Teodoro never acts violently or destructively as Basilio does. Cristina explains that Teodoro never means harm to anyone: he "[q]uedó incapaz de reinar,/ con tanto aborrecimiento del padre y de sus vasallos/ como has visto en él y en ellos,/ no porque furioso intente/ su daño ni provecho,/ mas porque en muchos discursos/ le falta el entendimeinto" (I, 212). In other words, Teodoro might be angry with his father and others, but it is only because he doesn't understand what's happening sometimes. In contrast, Isabela confirms that Basilio is a violent and inhumane tyrant, and ignorant of what is happening in his kingdom. She says he doesn't even know "cuantos tus Estados viven/ y malas obras reciben/ de tu absoluto power/ que eres un nuevo Nerón romano"

(I, 219). Like Nerón, he is blinded by his passions, becomes violently out of control, lacks reason and compassion, is ignorant of the state of his kingdom, and abuses his power to destroy his kingdom instead of protect it. It is Basilio, and not Teodoro, who is "más que los bárbaros fiero/ que están en el mar Adlante," because as a moral monster that cannot discern between good and evil, justice and abuse, theatens to disrupt the natural familial and political order. By having Basilio describe Teodoro as a monster at the opening of Act I, Lope artfully and subtly identifies Basilio himself as the real moral monster of the play while highlighting Basilio's own blindness to the real state of his son's health or that of his empire.

For example, Basilio also proves to be morally monstrous when he violently attacks Isabela and Juan. He questions Isabela's honor and she denies any wrongdoing, but he cannot control his anger and strikes her in the face. Then, in another moment of fury, he kills his own son, Juan, the last capable heir to the throne. When Juan confronts his father over his attack on Isabela, Basilio ignores Juan's reasoning that his father has dishonored his wife, and says his disobedience deserves the same treatment she received: "Si a ella dile el bofetón/ por lasciva e insolente,/ a ti por inobediente/ con este cetro o bastón" (I, 222). According to the stage directions, he then strikes Juan with his scepter, killing his own son, "hijo el más bueno/… y más lleno/ de virtud," (I, 222-223). In his violent attack, he ignores honor; destroys virtue; devastates his family structure and the legitimate line of inheritance; and causes familial and political disorder. With Juan dead, and Teodoro insane, the kingdom must be left in the hands of another moral monster, Boris, until Demetrio can come of age.

The way in which Basilio kills Juan is also morally monstrous because it is a deceptive abuse of power. The stick that becomes Basilio's weapon is a hybrid staff/scepter that represents punishment and power, respectively. The stage directions say, "Este bastón traen los Duques de

Moscovia por cetro" (I, 206), and Basilio says he will strike Juan with "este cetro o bastón" (I, 222). As a *bastón*, the stick he carries conjures notions of Ivan IV or Ivan the Terrible, the merciless tsar that famously carried an iron staff. As a *cetro*, on the other hand, the stick denotes monarchical sovereignty and justice. However, the quotes from the play inform us that to Basilio the *bastón* and the *cetro* are one in the same. Lope includes the hybrid staff/scepter to show Basilio has lost the ability to discriminate between just, fair punishment and vengeful, malicious injury.[69] Brody explains: "Thus, these diametrically opposite qualities become one in his mind, and it is shown that he does not know with which of the two, the royal scepter or the tyrant's stick, he will punish Juan . . . in Lope's view the highest symbol of justice can degenerate into a murderous tool when wielded by a tyrant" (108). Basilio's inability to know when to punish and when to use reason makes him as monstrously hybrid as his weapon of choice. He is a legitimate monarch with many desirable qualities; but his temper and his lack of justice make him ineffective and cause disorder in his family and the royal lineage. Lope depicts Basilio as a moral monster to show that when a king without restraint wields a symbol of justice, it becomes a fatal weapon. The ideal king, by contrast, is measured, just, and reasonable.

Lope also depicts Boris, Demetrio's temporary replacement and eventual usurper, as a morally monstrous tyrant. Through Boris, Lope conveys, by contrast, the characteristics of the ideal king, giving special importance to legitimate inheritance and divine will. Boris rejects his education and becomes an arrogant, evil, immoral monster. He is the grotesque distortion of all of Demetrio's ideal qualities: legitimate heir, educated and virtuous, chosen and favored by God. Lope juxtaposes these two characters in order to compare and contrast the desirable and undesirable traits of a monarch.

[69] According to Brody, the *bastón/cetro* Lope has Basilio carry is a historically inaccurate addition, because only Ivan IV carried a staff instead of a scepter (108).

Demetrio is the legitimate heir to his grandfather's monarchy (since his father is insane and his uncle is dead), but Boris is appointed to fill the position until Demetrio comes of age. However, once he attains power Boris becomes overcome by immorality, in the form of greed for absolute authority, and makes plans to keep his position permanently. Boris explains his plan: "El Duque [Basilio] es muerto, y en tan breves días/ ya tengo sus Estados en mis manos./ No has de llamar las pretensions mías/ los pensamientos locos y tiranos […] Justa razón, Rodulfo, me ha movido; dignamente merezco estos Estados […] Esos dos coadjutors que he tenido, […] los envío a la guerra de Tartaria./ Resta sólo Demetrio" (I, 228-229). Boris' comments reveal two important things about him. First, though he has been temporarily appointed, Boris says "justa razón" mandates he deserves to be emperor. Using distorted logic–civic law says Demetrio should eventually replace him–he justifies his usurpation. Secondly, Boris sends away his tutors, who were appointed to govern with him, so they will not disturb his plan. In doing so, he negates the education and counsel they would have provided him to ensure he governs well.

On the other hand, Demetrio stands in stark contrast to Boris as the legitimate ruler. For instance, Demetrio says, "Nací rey," (II, 240); the kingdom "de derecho es mío" (II, 245); and the count Palatino calls him "legítimo sucesor" (III, 273). In other words, Demetrio was born to be king, it is his right to be king, and he is the legitimate heir to the throne. Demetrio's logic is true, while Basilio's reasoning is false. Basilio distorts reason to fit his ambitions for power. Also in contrast to Boris, Demetrio receives an education fit for a prince. His mother sends him away with Lamberto to receive an education in "actos de príncipe, y […] armas y letras, porque ha de llegar el tiempo/ en que las letras te ayuden,/ las armas te den esfuerzo,/ porque en un príncipe juntas/ hacen un imperio eterno" (II, 213). Demetrio's education includes princely virtues and

manners, arms and letters. As his mother Cristina says, it is this education that will ensure his empire thrives. By contrast, Boris' rejection of counsel shows he is unfit to be king.

Boris is also devoid of virtue. He demonstrates arrogance by sending away his advisors; greed and excessive ambition when he names himself not only "gran duque de Moscovia," but also "César de Arazán" and "rey de Tartaria" because these places are the greatest in Europe (II, 239); and cruelty and injustice when he murders and poisons innocent people (II, 239). Under his sixteen-year tyrannical rule, the kingdom's unrest grows and they call him a tyrant. In contrast, Demetrio shows "heroica valentía" (I, 233), "humildad" (II, 264), and "valor" (II, 269). While Demetrio goes to the monastery to hide out as a friar, Boris arrives there and tries to bribe the prior to kill Demetrio, contrasting Demetrio's holiness against Boris' depravity. While Boris "tiraniza los estados" burning buildings and ordering executions (I, 233), Demetrio works close to the people sweeping and washing dishes as a harvester and a cook, contrasting Boris' greed and arrogance against Demetrio's simple nobility and humility. While Boris is hated, the people long for Demetrio, whom they suspect is alive, to re-take his rightful place as king.

Finally, while Boris chooses himself to be emperor and eliminates anyone who stands between him and retaining the throne, Demetrio is chosen by God to inherit it. For example, Rufino says God showed Demetrio favor by rescuing him from Boris' attempt to murder him: "que Dios te ha guardado,/ Él te volverá a tu reino" (I, 236). In another example, Lamberto tells Demetrio God will ensure his victory over evil: "Dios te dará victoria/ del tirano que ha diez años/ que de tu laurel se adorna" (II, 239). These quotes tell the audience Demetrio not only fits into the civic order, but also the divine order of the monarchy. In contrast, Boris is out of order as an illegitimate usurper.

In summary, Boris and Demetrio are two sides of the same coin. While Demetrio is the ideal prince, Boris is the morally monstrous version of the ideal monarch. Lope juxtaposes the man and the moral monster for two reasons: to underline Demetrio's worthy qualities, and to show the disorder and destruction of the unworthy ones. By highlighting how Boris deforms each of Demetrio's virtues and dramatizing the civil and divine disorder he causes, Lope is able to, by contrast, emphasize the importance of virtue, education, legitimacy, and divine favor in the ideal prince.

The issues of capacity to rule and legitimacy that are highlighted in this play reflect contemporary concerns about the monarchy in sixteenth and seventeenth century Spain. As with *Roma abrasada*, this play speaks to concerns about a prince's capacity to rule, which were likely created by Felipe II's virtuous but economically and politically incompetent reign. The *privanza* culture that began with Felipe III and continued through Felipe IV's reign created concerns about who was most capable of ruling the empire, as well as questions about legitimacy of governorship, and who should wield power and how much. Lope addresses these debates in *El gran duque de Moscovia*, using manfestations of monstrosity that embody excessive vice and violence and political disorder. Its function is to serve as a sign that the ideal king should have moral virtue, restraint, a solid education as well as political acumen; and also that only the legitimate and divinely appointed king should wield any monarchical power. As we see with Basilio, any monarch who lacks restraint will cause familial and political disorder and thus is also unfit to rule; and with Boris, that any one who displays none of these characteristics distorts and deforms the office of king such that he is a monster, against social, civil, and divine order, and thus also unsuitable to govern.

The fate of the monstrous characters in each play is also important for understanding Lope's conception of sovereignty. We can see from the analysis in this chapter that in these plays, Lope had an Aristotelian view of the monster, as an error or abomination of nature that diminishes divine creation and is thus morally reprehensible. These political monsters, who are detractors and distorters of God's divine creation and the cause of natural, civil, social, and divine disorder, cannot be left to their own destructive devices; they must be brought under control or eliminated in order to preserve the state.

In *El gran duque de Moscovia*, Lope eliminates the monster through divine order. While Boris thinks he can defeat Demetrio "[e]n gente,/ en oro, en fuerza, en valor" (III, 284), Demetrio achieves victory because God ordered it so. Demetrio says before going to battle, "El cielo en mi bien se muda" (III, 287) and "Dios me da favor/ para que cobre mi Estado" (III, 296). Even in the face of seemingly insurmountable odds–first, his army is a fraction of the size of Boris', and then, his men abandon him altogether–Demetrio trusts that God will restore him to his rightful office. In addition, Demetrio performs one last act of faith just before meeting Basilio, when he prays to the Virgin for help before going to the battlefield. Demetrio's divine favor and prayer seems to work, because he emerges victorious against the monstrous Boris. In this scene, Demetrio and Boris meet, Demetrio identifies himself, and then Boris surrenders. He says: "Pues quiere el cielo/ mostrar milagros en defensa tuya,/ vesme aquí de rodillas a tus plantas./ Por secretos del cielo y por castigo,/ yo te rendiré el alma envuelta en sangre" (III, 300). Boris proclaims that Demetrio has won because the heavens have performed miracles on his behalf, confirming Demetrio was protected and assisted by God. Then, recognizing the futility of his efforts to thwart divine will, Boris takes his own life to deny Demetrio the chance to pardon

him. With this scene, Lope shows the monstrous king should be defeated through the bravery of the righteous king, and divine will.

In *Roma abrasada*, the people of the Roman Senate bring the monstrous Nerón under control. Throughout most of the play, Nerón commits his atrocious acts unchallenged. When he sentences Séneca to death, Séneca exclaims, "¡Sufrís,/ cielos, tal monstruo y calláis!" criticizing the silence of the people in the face of such monstrosity, and imploring the people to take action against the tyrant (III, 286). However, it is not until the Senate meets that any decision is made to challenge Nerón. Galba reports that Roma is complaining of "este monstruo,/ que dicen que ha nacido entre los hombres/ como veneno de naturaleza" (III, 292). Unrest has grown because Nerón is poisoning his own people, literally and metaphorically, and now they want to kill him. At first, the only action the Senate takes it to elect Galba as the new emperor, without dealing with the tyrant he will have to replace. Galo says the Senate is hoping he'll die before they have to do something: "El pueblo infame contento,/ y el vil Senado cobarde,/ quieren que al cielo se guarde/ la muerte deste sangriento, y de manera consiente/ y uno y otro sus daños/ que ha de llegar a cien años/ y morir naturalmente" (III, 295). The people have been complacent because Nerón has paid them off, and the Senate would rather wait for the heavens to take care of him than take action themselves; but he warns that Nerón will live to be 100 if they remain reticent. In this scene, Lope discounts the option to allow the heavens or old age to kill the monster.

In the mouths of Virginio and Hortensio, Lope offers what he sees as the only alternative. Virginio asks the Senate why they are bothering to meet if they are not going to take action; and Hortensio says the Senate must take responsibility for eliminating the monster: "Tiene Virginio razón;/ que esto, Senado, es traición/ que a la misma Roma hacéis,/ pues se sabe que por miedo/ la lisonja y la maldad/ han vencido a la verdad" (III, 295-296). Treason, Hortensio says, is not

rebelling against the tyrant; treason is allowing a monster destroy their empire while placating the people through flattery and fear. So, the Senate rallies the Roman people and they all march off to kill the tyrant. Fenicio warns Nerón that the people are coming and Nerón asks him for advice. Fenicio responds, "Señor, aquéste es vulgo amotinado," and suggests he run or take his own life (III, 301). Like Tirso's Don Juan Tenorio, who thinks he can live sinfully and foolishly thinking he has plenty of time to repent before death, Nerón continues to commit his crimes even after many warnings from advisors and friends, and he repents too late to save himself. He says, "¿Esto es morir? Cosa es clara/ que, sis u pena supiera,/ nunca yo a tantos matara" (III, 503). If he had known what it would be like to die, he says, he would have corrected his behavior sooner.

However, Nerón is too late. Fenicio implies the strength and effectiveness of a popular rebellion are what's needed to ensure the defeat of a tyrant, and Nerón won't stand much chance against them. Finally, the roman people find Nerón, but he has already stabbed himself to death. They affirm Galba as the new emperor, and the play ends. Lope not only follows the historical succession of events of Neron's end, but also justifies popular rebellion against the tyrant from the realist point of view that the state must be preserved at all costs, even in the face of apparent immorality.

In these two plays, Lope uses morally monstrous characters to point out the vices and disordering behaviors of a bad king as dehumanizing forces, as destructive to the established order, and as requiring elimination. In *Roma abrasada*, Nerón's vices dehumanize him to the point such that he kills his family, murders his court and burns his kingdom, wreaking havoc on civic, social, and divine order. In *El gran duque de Moscovia*, Basilio shows the disorder that results from not possessing all of the necessary qualities to become an effective ruler; while

Boris' monstrosity results from his utter deformation of each and every desirable quality of the ideal prince. Demetrio, in contrast, is emphasized as the ideal emperor.

Lope also discusses the role of free and divine will in the success of the king. *El gran duque de Moscovia* is an example of how divine order will eliminate the monster and restore the kingdom to its righteous state. This message follows the view of the ethicists; Gracián writes that divine Providence is the ultimate author of the king's destiny "Providencia es la suma autora de los imperios, que no la ciega vulgar fortuna" (60). On the other hand, *Roma abrasada* warns that divine will may take too long, and a popular rebellion is warranted and legitimate if necessary to the survival of the state. This play supports the view of the realists, who insisted free will played a critical role in the king's success or failure. Mártir Rizo writes in *Norte de príncipes*, "el príncipe que gobierna es hombre, y el imperio que tiene sobre sí es igual al de los otros" (44). In other words, the person who governs is a man, and as such he must also govern himself and his actions. In sum, Lope conveys in these plays that those kings who use free will for evil and disorder are monstrous, while the ideal prince, though God orders his destiny, does not ignore the responsibility of free will.

The depiction of monarchs from history as moral monsters reveals how Lope viewed the identity of the prince: as monarch, but also as man. McKendrick writes, "Drama, of course, removes kings from their palaces and shows them to be not merely men but much of the time to be men as others are" (*Playing the King* 26). What Lope's audience witnessed on his stage was the rise and fall of men who become political monsters, whose tyranny, on the surface, appears to be largely the result of a perverted nature or brutal aggression. Upon closer inspection, however, we can see that these tyrant kings become monsters as the result of their human frailty,

their susceptibility to sin, corruption, subterfuge, and political ambition. The fall of the monarch into monstrosity is a political affair, but it is also a human one.

Lope ironically suggests that the most ideal monarch of all is a monster of a different kind, a monster in the sense of extraordinary virtue and utter lack of sin. The monstrously pure king would not be made fallible by his earthly, human body, but would become fully his other body, the divine corpus, which transcends the earthly and serves as a symbol of his office as majesty with the divine right to rule.[70] Rivilla de Bonet y Pueyo explains, "Y como en rigorosa accepción puede aver veneno malo, y bueno, assí por cierta energía, ò hyperbole se dize Monstro de maldad, el demasiadamente perverso, como Monstro de santidad el heroicamente justo, de fealdad, y de beldad lo que merece vna, û otra de estas qualidades" (Chapter 1, 2v). Lope makes clear that the one monster, the extremely evil, cruel, and sinful monster, is undesirable; but he also, by contrast, conveys the other monster, the ultimately virtuous and saintly, is idyllic. The perfect king must deny his own human frailty; he must become inhuman, monstrously divine.

However, the reality is that the monarch is, by nature, a fallible human, and as such needs a sound education so that he can learn how to avoid falling into sinful and destructive behaviors. Treatises and counselors were two ways princes could receive their education; a third and more enjoyable way was for the prince to attend the theater. In 1646, Melchor de Cabrera y Guzmán writes in his *Defensa por el uso de las comedias y suplica al Rey nuestro señor para que se continuen*, "pues el Príncipe, viendo representar acciones heroycas de otro, templa las que más le apassionan y halla quien sin nota le acusa de error ú descuido, y toma modelo para adelante. El señor mira como en vn espejo lo imperfecto de su proceder y como buen pintor borra el defecto y fealdad para quedar sin la mancha que le deshora" (97). The *corral* serves as a place not only for

[70] For more on the notion of the king's two bodies, See Kantorowizc.

Spanish society to be entertained by fictional interpretations of real-world political concerns; it was also a place where kings could glean lessons from their counterparts' experiences on stage. The manifestations of monstrosity in these plays would have helped his audience, both popular and royal, pinpoint the reasons behind the fall of the tyrannical kings, as well as recognize what qualities are desirable and undesirable in a prince, in what situations, and why.

I do not mean to argue that Lope dramatizes Spanish political reality exactly as it was, writing simply "lo que ha sucedido" or "lo particular." Spaniards supported the monarchy and its authority and laws of succession were not in question in early modern Spain (McKendrick, *Playing the King* 36). Rather, Lope is like the Aristotelian poet, who dramatizes "lo que podría suceder" or "lo general" (*Poética* 1454b1-21). In other words, Lope's *comedias* are artistic renderings of his political reality and expositors of universal political experiences and truths. The plays studied in this chapter would have been entertaining to Lope's audience because they re-interpreted familiar stories about tyrannical kings from history, and also because they deal with the same universal theories on the legitimacy, effectiveness, and sovereignty of a king that were extant in their own society.

It is through the use of monstrous characters that Lope is able to subvert an official ideology that only served to exalt the king and his office, and represent the ongoing political concerns among political theorists and the people. Proving he does not hold a monolithic view of the monarchy, Lope demonstrates an understanding of the complexities of the competing beliefs regarding the identity of the Spanish monarchy, including who has the right to the throne; what characteristics comprise an effective ruler; the appropriate limits of monarchical power; and the tension between the king in his role as a political leader and as a human being.

The contrast between divine purpose and human frailty as a creator of monsters is also a theme in two plays about discovery, colonization, and conversion, *El nuevo mundo descubierto por Cristóbal Colón and Las batuecas del duque de Alba*, which are examined in the next chapter.

Chapter III

Monstrosity and (Re)Conquest in *El nuevo mundo descubierto por Cristóbal Colón* and *Las batuecas del duque de Alba*

Beginning in the fifteenth century, there is a revival of interest in Spanish historiography.[71] Spanish historians and intellectuals had renewed interest in establishing a history of Spain that went back as far as possible, and in many cases, to biblical times, in order to counter the Italian humanist notion that Italians were the direct descendants of the Greco-Roman Antiquity and therefore superior to Spain (Ryjik 31-32).[72] The desire to create renown for Spain's past in comparison to Italy's also stemmed from attempts to, through historical discourse, establish the superiority of Spain among other European nations. To stand apart from Italy and the rest of Europe, it was important not only to construct a past as ancient as possible, but also to exalt the qualities of the protagonists of Spain's past. The interest these humanist writers in the fifteenth through the seventeenth centuries had in Spain's history also coincided with efforts by the Crown, beginning with the Catholic Monarchs, to generate an "official"

[71] The following primary works are evidence of renewed interest in Spanish historiography: Rodrigo Sánchez de Arévalo, *Compendiosa Historia Hispanica* (c. 1470); Joan Margarit i Pau's *Paralipomenon Hispaniae* and Antonio de Nebrija's *Muestra de la Historia de las Antigüedades de España*, both written toward the end of the fifteenth century; Alonso García de Matamoros, *Pro adserenda Hispanorum erdutitione* (1553); and Florián de Ocampo, *Crónica general de España* (1543).

[72] For a summary of the motives behind the historiographical movement in Spain and its relationship to similar movement in Italy, see Ryjik, especially 30-43.

history that would serve the interests of the monarchy.[73] This official history would legitimize the new, united Spain both at home and abroad; it would depict the antiquity and greatness of the Spanish monarchy and help dissipate myths of a barbaric past; justify the legitimacy of the dynasty of Isabel la Católica; and, by employing a Castile-centric perspective, defend the preeminence of Castile among the other peninsular kingdoms.

In the early modern period, *crónicas* were only one vehicle for cultivating a complete Spanish history. Genealogies, *la leyenda épica*, *la épica culta, romanceros* and other oral traditions such as *juglares*, poetry and music contributed to the (re)creation of Spain's preeminent past. One of the most important ways this national history was created and propagated was through the theater. Peak production of plays that dramatized events from Spain's past occurred during the first years of the seventeenth century, and Lope de Vega was the dramatist who most exploited Spain's history for the stage.[74] Between the years of 1599-1613, he wrote more than forty historical plays.[75] Though Lope endeavored almost his entire life to become the *cronista real*, he never achieved his goal and instead dedicated himself to bringing Spanish history to the stage.[76] Famously imprecise with regard to historical fact, Lope takes much artistic license as he manipulates and invents Spain's history for the *corrales*. This chapter demonstrates that in *El nuevo mundo descubierto por Cristóbal Colón* and *Las batuecas del*

[73] For a study on the political propaganda employed by Isabel to prove the legitimacy of her Castilian throne, see Carrasco Manchado.

[74] Lope, of course, is not an isolated case. In addition to writers such as Juan de la Cueva and Cervantes, almost every dramatist created plays that adapted events from Spanish history for the stage.

[75] The reasons behind this surge have been discussed by Spang and Oleza.

[76] See Bershas for more on Lope's endeavors to become a *cronista real*.

duque de Alba, Lope de Vega re-writes stories from Spain's history to include monstrous characters in order to project his own version of Spanish national identity that exalts its moral and political successes and while distancing itself from the moral monsters that sully its image as a nation that is politically powerful, Christian, and virtuous.

El nuevo mundo descubierto por Cristóbal Colón begins with a brief history of Colón's quest for patronage.[77] With his brother Bartolomé, he visits a series of short-sighted, mocking kings and their advisors. Only Fernando and Isabela, who have just recently defeated Granada, give him support for his voyage. The second act shows an on-board rebellion of Colón's men on the ship. Soon after they threaten to throw him overboard, they arrive on land and encounter the Indians for the first time. Colón erects a cross on the beach, and then returns to Spain, leaving behind the rest of his men in the New World. Left alone to their own devices, Cólon's men display concupiscence and greed, especially Terrazas, and their evil doings cause the Cacique Dulcanquellín (also referred to as Dulcán in the play) to massacre the Spaniards and tear down the cross they have installed. When the destroyed cross miraculously regenerates itself, the Indians realize their mistake and are thus ensured salvation. The play ends with a courtly pageant in which Colón appears before the monarchs, and the Indians he has brought with him are baptized, with Fernando as their godfather.[78]

---

[77] I have used the Biblioteca Castro editions of both plays here, even though R.M. Shannon has produced a critical edition of *El nuevo mundo* (New York: P. Lang, 2001), in the interest of continuity of citation with the other plays. I have consulted the critical edition when necessary.

[78] Menéndez y Pelayo (1949) mentions the *Historia general y natural de las Indias* by Gonzálo Fernández de Oviedo (1535) and the *Historia general de las Indias* by Francisco López de Gómara (1552) as Lope's sources. R. Minian de Alfie admits Pietro Martire d'Anghiera to the list, as well as Alvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca, Agustín de Zárate, Pedro Cieza de León and Alonso de Ercilla). Martinengo adds, among others, Colón's son Fernando. As is typical of Lope, he does not follow any of these sources faithfully, but contaminates one with the other as well as adding his own artistic interpretation of the accounts.

This play, unlike the others studied in this dissertation, contains only one instance of the word *monstruo*, and it is used in a positive sense. The other instances of monstrosity in the play are negative, and lie in descriptions of Spanish explorers who are imagined in monstrous terms, symbolizing their inner moral monstrosity. The one example of the use of the word *monstruo* is significant. When it is examined in conjunction with the other, more abstract manifestations of monstrosity in the play, we can more fully understand the bifurcate view of the conquest that Lope presents in the work: as both a moral and politically successfully endeavor lead by the virtuous and monstrously extraordinary explorer Colón; but also as an effort corrupted by the monstrous immorality of Colón's men, whose treatment of the Indians and their possessions is an affront to Christian ideals.

At the end of the play, the action returns to Spain, where Colón is welcomed at the palace of Fernando and Isabela to be praised for his discovery. The Gran Capitán announces to Don Fernando that Colón has arrived, surrounded by a throng of people, to which he replies,"Quien supo, quien hizo tanto/ merece aplauso decente./ Por monstuo y por maravilla,/ sin primero ni segundo,/ le vea el mundo, pues dio un mundo/ a los reyes de Castilla" (III, 1008). For Don Fernando, Colón should be seen by the world as both a monster and a marvel because he brought a New World to the monarchs. He is both monster and marvel in the admirable sense that he has done something truly extraordinary that required a seemingly inhuman amount of skill, fortitude, and faith that is second to none. An extraordinary man among men, Fernando explains that Colón is a figure that elicits awe and wonder for his accomplishments, a remarkable explorer who has done what no one before him had achieved. However, while Colón embodies the monster in an admirable way, his men are described as monsters in a negative way, as moral monsters that, according to the Demonio, are going to the New World because of "oro y codicia"

and threaten Colón's mission to expand the Spanish empire to the New World and convert the idolatrous Indians to Christianity (I, 946).

Though several scholars have studied the representation of the Spanish characters in this play, the depiction of the Indian characters, and how the Spanish characters perceive the Indians, they have largely ignored the scene in which Lope imaginatively renders the Indians' perception of the Spaniards upon their arrival to the New World.[79] Lope has the Indians describe what they witness as Colón and his men land and disembark their ships. It is important to examine these scenes because, as M.R. Castillo has noted, this is Lope's first play to interpret a New World conquest, and also the first of his plays in which an Indian character appears on stage as a part of the dramatic action, and not only by allusion (57). Therefore, the speech of multiple Indian characters' on Lope's stage is a unique opportunity to deepen our understanding of how he conceived of the relationship between the Spaniards and the indigenous peoples, as well as how Lope imagines the Indian interpretation of the conquest. Ruiz Ramón (1993) writes that it is interesting that "Lope dé mayor importancia dramática a la operación fenomenológica de cómo los indios ven a los españoles que a la visión que los españoles tienen de los indios, tratando de hacer ver el descubrimiento a través de los ojos de los descubiertos antes que por los de los

[79] For example, see Castillo 49-71; Carey-Webb 33-55; Ryjik 190-215; Chamandijan; Kirschner; Soufas; Marsical; and Case (1992). Nelson is the only scholar I have found to have treated the Indian perspective in depth. He attempts to "highlight the apparent innocence, or lack of allegorical self-awareness, characterizing their [the Indians'] initial interpretations of the trans-Atlantic encounter. What such naiveté demonstrates is that even though the *indios* are intuitively correct in their interpretation of religious symbols [which they incorporate in their description of the strange occurrence of the arrival of the Spaniards], they are unable to fully possess the theological meaning, which exceeds their innate capacity for (ir)rational thought" (91).

descubridores" (35).[80] In other words, the fact that Lope gives such dramatic importance to these scenes, even more dramatic importance than the perspective of the Spaniards, means they must be relevant to the messages he conveys with the work. To better understand the significance of this alternative version of events, it is indispensable to analyze the monstrous terms the Indians use to describe their visitors.

The first Indian to offer his version is Auté. He reports to the others that he has seen three houses that walk on the waters, from which emerge men who seem to be happy and measured, "que traen sobre las caras,/ como en la misma cabeza,/ espeso cabello y barba" (II, 966-967). Some of the men raise cloths with chords while others shout. Their bodies are unusual: "Las carnes son de colores,/ a partes angostas y anchas,/ que solamente les vi/ blanco rostro y manos blancas,/ de donde a veces salían/ de unos palos unas llamas/ envueltas en trueno y humo/ que me dejaron sin habla" (II 967). The Spaniards are wide in some parts and narrow in others, with multicolored flesh, white faces, and white hands that hold branches that from time to time emit flames, thunder, and smoke. Auté adds that he hears many times the words "Dios, tierra y Virgen," but he does not understand their language or what these words mean. Finally, he warns the other Indians that they must make a plan, because these houses are advancing quickly (II, 966-967).[81]

Auté describes the Spaniards as hirsute, deformed, multicolored figures with strange sticks that flame, thunder and smoke, which arrive in houses that walk on water. Though he

[80] Castañeda agrees, "Esta inversión en el punto de vista es, en si misma, significativa, porque alude a una intención dramática general de reordenar los acontecimientos y de ofrecer una versión alternativa de su significado" (38).

[81] I have used the English translation found in Shannon's bilingual edition of the play here and elsewhere.

describes the men as humans, his interpretation of the Spaniards deforms them into strange and extraordinary monsters. The audience would have known, of course, that the houses are ships, the cloths are sails, and the men's hair would have been long from the long journey across the ocean. They would also have recognized that the colors on their skins come from their tunics; the difference in widths of their bodies would be the result of wearing armor; and the flaming sticks are guns. However, the Indians can only describe them based on their own paradigms, which results in a comical and monstrous image. Shannon, writing on this scene and others from the play, states that their purpose is to demonstrate the innocence and simplicity of the Indians, and that in their wild distortion of reality, they provide comic relief.[82] Cañadas writes that the scene is a way to infantilize the Indians, showing their ignorance of civilization, and simultaneously that they are primed for conversion and assimilation.[83] The Indians can perceive the novelty of what they see, but they lack the vocabulary necessary to explain it; can only interpret the vision through their own "uncivilized" paradigms (Kirschner 1993, 55; Ariza 38). It is true that Lope's audience would have found the descriptions comically incorrect, but the monstrous description is also significant. The Indians describe the Spaniards as monsters, as beings that are outside of what the Indians know to be the natural order, who are gravely disproportionate, deformed versions of the human form they know, and it alludes to the inner, moral monstrosity of the Spaniards that will be displayed as the play continues. The fact that the first description the Indians offer of the Spaniards arriving in their land paints them as bizarre and frightening

[82] Shannon writes, "One of the most humorous scenes in the play . . . Lope exposes here the lack of knowledge by the indigenous society concerning some of the most common aspects of European society . . . Lope uses the scene to create humor and astonishment and to stress again the need to propagate the doctrines of the Church to the 'bárbaros'" (87).

[83] Cañadas agrees with Shannon: "these characters are, if not demonized, certainly infantilised" (68).

monsters foreshadows their display of monstrous immorality in the form of social disorder, greed, and lust.

Lope depicts the indigenous world before the arrival of the Spaniards as a type of paradise. The stage directions ask that just before the ship lands, the "Indios salgan con tamborillos y pandero, dos indios y dos indias, y detrás otros dos como novios y los que pudieren acompañar, y siéntense" (II, 956). Kirschner (1992) observes that the scene, with its collective singing and dancing, reflects the harmony of the indigenous realm, with mountains, a green shore, blue sea, and a beach where the sun always shines (II, 957). The audience also sees the peaceful ritual of the wedding of Dulcán and Tacuana, and a display of honor and courtly love as Dulcán tells Tacuana, his bride by the spoils of war, he will wait as long as necessary to consummate their marriage until she decides she loves him in return (II, 961). In this scene, Lope shows the New World was not only a paradise in a natural sense, but also demonstrates the humanity of the New World and its similarity to the Old one. However, when the Spanish arrive, they wreak havoc on the Indians' paradise-like scenery. They first enter through sound, firing shots toward the shore, disrupting the peaceful sound of the earlier singing and harmony. The ship that enters the scene has been a place of chaos and disorder even before its arrival, as Colón's men shout in frustration at him and even try to throw him overboard, upsetting the hierarchy of command. Kirschner explains, "El mundo de la carabela es un mundo con grita…caos, violencia, y alteración del orden jerárquico" ("Exposición y subversión" 52-53). The audible and visual unrest and disorder the Spaniards bring to the stage as they enter it matches the monstrous image the Indians construct of them in their descriptions. The ship and its monstrous-looking men are the harbingers of more disorder and destruction to come, caused by the Spaniards' zest for economic and sexual conquest above Christian salvation. In this scene,

the Indians' description not only imagines the Spaniards as the monstrous Other, but blurs the boundary between civilization and barbarism, Self and Other, as one "monster" identifies another.

Upon hearing Auté's description, another Indian, the Cacique Dulcanquellín calls him a fool, and says he knows what they must be: "Peces son, peces que braman:/ que andando por esas islas/ a hartarse de carne humana,/ se han comido aquesos hombres/ que a voces sus dioses llaman,/ y con la gran pesadumbre/ los vomitan en la playa,/ dando un trueno cada uno/ que arrojan de las entrañas" (II, 967-968).[84] Dulcán describes the Spaniards as beings that, for Lope's audience, also sound like monsters: roaring, man-eating fish (akin to the sea monsters that so frequently appeared in contemporaneous maps and *relaciones de sucesos*) who vomit the men they devour and emit thunder with each heave of their innards.[85] The image of the roaring fish conjures images of a monster, half lion (or another roaring animal) and half fish. The *Diccionario de autoridades* reminds us that mixtures of animals are monstrous: "juntas de animales de diversa naturaleza, causan también monstruos" (598). The monstrous, carnivorous fish is able to survive on land, on the beach, as well as in the sea, adding to its hybridism and natural disorder. Though this imagining of the Spaniards by the Cacique would have been comical, and perhaps a display of the Cacique's inferiority in intelligence to the civilized Spaniards, Lope chose these words carefully to convey a double-edged message of humiliation

[84] Entrambasaguas has suggested that Lope takes this legend and others from one of the chronicles of the Araucanians of Chile.

[85] The most famous example of a sea monster in the *relaciones de sucesos* is the merman called "el pez Nicolás." Though he does not roar or devour men, Nicolás was a popular cultural phenomenon. Among the many *relaciones* in which Nicolás appears, we have *Relación de cómo el pece Nicolao se ha aparecido de nuevo en el mar, y habló con muchos marineros en diferentes partes, y de las grandes maravillas. Este pece Nicolao es medio hombre, y medio pescado* […] Barcelona: Sebastián de Cormellas, 1608. For more on the diffusion of this legend in Spain, see J. Caro Baroja. On the *pliegos* that transmit the legend, see M. D'Agostino.

of the ignorant Indio and to symbolize the dehumanizing immorality of the destructive Spaniards.

The monstrous image of the Spaniards implies a subtle criticism on the part of Lope of the violence the Spaniards were known for in the Americas.[86] As Kirschner has argued, Lope explicitly incorporates the controversy created by the debate between Bartolomé de las Casas, who criticized Pedro Arias Dávila's brutality in his *Brevísima relación de la destrucción de las Indias* and Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda over the legitimacy of the conquest and the Spaniards' treatment of the Indians, still a burning question in Lope's time ("The Staging" 38). On the one hand, Lope does not criticize the mission itself and in fact justifies the mission by depicting it as both an extension of the Reconquest and as a deliverance of a people from evil.[87] We also see this idea supported in Don Fernando's praise of Colón at the end of the play. Consequently, he demonstrates support for the views of Ginés de Sepúlveda, Palacio Rubio, and others, as scholars such as Lauer (1993) and Soufas have argued. On the other hand, as Dixon and Castillo argue, Lope does also criticize *how* they attempted to complete the mission, by which he shows favor to

[86] For more on the encounter of the Spaniards with the Indians and the debate about the nature of the conquest and its mission of conversion, see Elliot (2006), especially Chapter 3.

[87] At the end of the first act, Colón says to King Fernando: "Señor, pues acabastes la conquista/ felicísimamente de Granada,/ ahora es tiempo de ganar un mundo,/ que no penséis que es menos lo que ofrezco./ Grande es España, pero sois tan grandes,/ que si no le añadís un mundo nuevo,/ es imposible que quepáis entrambos … Yo iré si tú, señor, me das ayuda/ a conquistar los indios, los idólatras;/ que es justo que a la fe cristiana nuestra/ reduzca un Rey que se llamó Católico,/ con la prudente y más dischosa Reina/ que han visto las edades de oro antiguas" (I, 949-950). On the deliverance of the Indians, see especially scenes from Act III in which the Indians are converted and repent (III, 1004-1007).

the view of humanists such as Las Casas, Francisco de Vitoria, José de Acosta, and Pedro de Valencia.[88] In this play, Lope dramatizes the perspectives of both sides of the conquest debate.

Lope represents the perspective of those who criticized the conquest by creating monstrous Spanish characters. For instance, the Indians imagine the Spaniards as man-eating fish. Nelson reminds us, "Let us not forget that the goal of the Spaniards is the absorption of American Otherness into their own political body" (90). The action Dulcán describes, of the fish eating and spitting out the internal organs of men, suggests a metaphorical assimilation (eating) and simultaneous purging (eviscerating and spitting out again the undesirable parts) of the Other (Nelson 91).[89] The Spaniards, as man-eating, roaring fish, devour (assimilate) and destroy (vomit) the Indian people. In other words, their methods are a violent and grotesque way for one empire (Spanish) to convert and assimilate another (Indian).

Weiner (1983) affirms that Lope does support a more human treatment of the Indians: "El mensaje de Lope en esta obra no puede ser más claro: que el amor del cristianismo convierte mientras que la fuerza y el pecado repugnan" (69). In other words, Lope favors a more *lascasian* position regarding how the Indians should be treated during their conversion, and uses the image of the roaring, man-eating fish to convey the idea that the conquest of the Indies is excessively cruel, repugnant, and immoral. Again, the monstrous images the Indians use to describe the Spanish at once dehumanize them in their immorality, as well as dehumanize the Indian in their

[88] Castillo writes, "pienso que en ningún caso se está poniendo en duda los resultados y menos los motivos de la conquista [la evangelización, la posibilidad de hacer súbditos de la corona a los indios y la riqueza derivada de oro y plata], sino los modos en los que los peninsulares la llevan a término" (62).

[89] Nelson interprets this scene as a metaphor for the assimilation and redemption of the natives (i.e. they are re-gurgitated and thus re-born), but I disagree. Dulcán specifically mentions that what the fish vomit are "entrañas" only, meaning the men have been digested, dismantled, and destroyed in the process of assimilation, and not renewed or converted.

naiveté and in the fragmentation of their cultural body by the voracious appetites of their conquerors.

The idea of the Spaniards as man-eating fish also invokes the notion of cannibalism, which marks the Spaniards as monstrously Other. M. Greer writes, "[t]o classify people as anthropophagous is to mark them with the most radical sign of alterity and barbarity, as creatures alien to reason and civil society, closer to cannibalistic species of animals than to ethical human community (278). Lope's image of the Spaniards as fish that engorge themselves with human flesh is symbolic of a monstrously immoral, unethical, and unreasonable practices. By associating the Spaniards with a cannibalistic image, Lope makes them an abject fragment of the Spanish empire abroad and inadmissible participants in a mission that originally intended to fulfill political and religious duties in a way that affirmed Spain's political and moral preeminence.

The trait of cannibalism becomes another shared, monstrous trait between the *conquistadores* and the conquered. If the Spaniards are "cannibals" in a metaphorical sense, in that they violently "devour" the Indian population, its wealth and women; then the indigenous people are cannibalistic in a literal sense, which the audience learns when Dulcanquellín tells Auté: "Mata . . . cuatro criados/ de los más gordos que hallares,/ los pon en la mesa asados/ y entre silvestres manjares" (II, 982-983). Elliot writes of the Spaniards' appetite for New World wealth:

> The Spaniards, slipping easily into the position of the privileged elites they had vanquished, took immediate advantage of the glittering opportunities that opened up before them. While their first response was to seize and share out the portable booty, they also moved quickly to make themselves the masters of economic and tributary systems… To satisfy their own overwhelming greed they were all too soon to wrench these systems out of context…In effect for the first twenty or thirty years after the conquest of Mexico and Peru, the conquerors heedlessly ran a form of plunder economy. (Empires 89)

In other words, the Spaniards quickly and greedily confiscated wealth from the Indians, while effecting a vast program of conversion and indoctrination that would also "reduce" the Indians to European norms of behavior (Elliot, Empires 67). The idea of cannibalism–material and cultural in the example of the Spaniards, and anthropophagus in the example of the Indians–is thus suggested as a characteristic of both the Spaniards and the Indians in this play, causing the distinction between the Self and the Other to collapse. In their shared cannibalism, both groups become monstrously Other.[90] Lope insinuates the similarity between the two groups in their barbaric practices. For the Indians, this includes the actual practice of eating human flesh; for the Spanish, it includes violently "consuming" the Indian people as they seek souls for God, vassals for the King and wealth and women for themselves. By ascribing cannibalism as a trait in both the Spaniards and the Indians, Lope subtly challenges the supposed moral superiority of Colón's men, as well as the legality of the conquest of the Americas and forcing the Indians to convert to Christianity. Francisco de Vitoria, in his *On the Evangelization of Unbelievers* (1534-1535) cites cannibalism as the sole legitimizing factor of the conquest:

> …there are some sins against nature which are harmful to our neighbors, such as cannibalism or euthanasia of the old and senile, which is practiced in Terra Firma; and since the defence of our neighbors is the rightful concern of us, even for private persons and even if it involves shedding blood, it is beyond doubt that any Christian prince can compel them not to do these things. By this title alone the emperor is empowered to coerce the Caribbean Indians (insulani). (347)

If the Indians imagine the Spaniards as anthropophagus monsters, then Lope implies the justification of the conquest based on the Indians cannibalism is not sufficient reason for the violence and bloodshed that accompany the Indian's conversion. Challenging the civilization/barbarity binary, the image of the man-eating fish has implications for how Lope's

[90] On the notion of cultural mimesis of the colonizer by the colonized (the reverse of what we see here), see Fuchs, especially Chapter 6.

audience would have interpreted the Spanish characters' sins on stage as well as the real-world Spanish evangelizers' methods of conquest and conversion.

Tapirazú, not to be outdone by his rival Dulcán, offers another monstrous vision of the Spaniards, saying these men are, according to his grandfather, descendents of a race of giants as tall as pine trees, who once lived in the mountains near the coast and coupled with one another: "Yo sé mejor lo que ha sido,/ que éstas son reliquias claras/ de los gigantes que un tiempo/ vinieron a estas montañas./ Eran hombres de la altura/ de un pino, y que siempre andaban/ orilla del mar pescando/ sobre esas rotas pizarras" (II, 968). Perceived as excessive in size, the Spaniards appear monstrous to the Indians. The image of the Spaniards as giants indicates their disobedience to God. Egido (1995) writes, "El carácter demoníaco de los gigantes venía ya delimitado desde antiguo. Se les tenía por descendientes de los ángeles caídos y de las hijas del hombre. La desobediencia del hombre en el Paraíso determinó a lo largo de la Edad Media la creencia en que todo tipo de razas monstruosas y degeneradas provenían de la caída en el pecado" (50). The image of the Spaniards as giants, related to the disobedient and fallen angels, foreshadows the immoral disobedience to God through the idolization of American gold and sex, especially by the evil character Terrazas. The Spaniards' disobedience to God's mission is also referenced in the discussion among the allegorical characters of Providencia, Religión, Idolatría y el Demonio in Act I. Providencia makes clear that the mission is to "gana[r] almas" (I, 944): "Esta conquista se intente/ que para Cristo ha de ser" (I, 945), while Idolatría insists they are going "So color de religion/ van a buscar plata y oro/ del descubierto tesoro" (I, 945). In other words, the men are supposed to be going to the new world for God; but in the end, their purpose becomes to find as much treasure as possible. The play does not condemn the idea that the wealth of the Indies will be a part of the conquest, helping to fund it and potentially expand the

Spanish empire and Christ's kingdom in the future.[91] It does criticize, however, the *worship* of that wealth that reaches idolatrous proportions, evidenced by events such as Terrazas kissing bars of gold "mientras les dices la fe" (II, 982).[92] The Indians' identification of the Spaniards as giants, and the connotations of disobedience and idolatry the image carries, makes the Spaniards into moral monsters. It also shows how one idolatrous, spiritually disobedient group is able to recognize another, putting into question the spiritual supremacy and self-control of the Spanish explorers over the Indians.

Tapirazú adds that his grandfather told him another piece of information about the giants: "Contaba déstos mi abuelo/ que por allí se juntaban/ hombres con hombres," suggesting the homosexuality of the giants of his grandfather's story (II, 968). In a heteronormative culture like that of Renaissance Spain, describing the Spaniards as homosexual giants indicates they were outside the natural, social, and religious order. The homosexuality ascribed to the Spaniards in this scene also alludes to their sexual immorality, in their disordered sexual appetites for indigenous women, such as Terrazas' lust for Tacuana, dramatized in Act II.

Finally, a third interpretation by the Indians of the Spaniards as monsters comes from a frightened Tecué, who says the floating houses (ships), pregnant with men, have given birth to a large, four-legged creature with two heads, one of which emerged from the middle of its body. He describes it as having flaring nostrils, a neck and forehead covered with curling locks, a foaming mouth, long ears, a large belly and a high thin voice. This is, of course, a man on a horse, an animal unknown to the inhabitants of the New World until the arrival of the Spaniards. The "birth" of the monstrous beings from the floating houses echoes the image of a monstrous

[91] See R. Castells 386.

[92] For further explanation on this distinction, see R. Castells, especially 388-390.

birth, where a woman gives birth to a child that is part human and part animal, or with extra appendages.[93] These monstrous births were often interpreted as a portent or warning of things to come, and Dulcán responds that this monstrous birth, the arrival of such grotesque beings, is a bad omen. He says, "Cielo, ¿qué prodigio empiezas? … Hoy, Tapirazú, recelo/ nuestra injusta perdición" (II, 976-977). As if to confirm that the Spaniards are indeed monstrous portents, immediately after Dulcán's comments the audience hears shots from the Spaniards, foreshadowing the destruction that will befall the Indians.

The imagining of the Spaniards as monsters means they are imagined as out of order, outside of nature, a portent. The monsters of this scene serve as divine omens for the Indians, as Dulcán tells us, of their impending *perdición*; or, as the Spaniards see it, as signs of their impending *salvación*. The monstrous images of the Spaniards that the Indians describe reflect the hybrid identity of the Spaniards as, on the one hand, responsible for the expansion of the Spanish empire and the Catholic Church, redeemers of the barbarian souls; and on the other, as immoral and violent destroyers of Indian culture and life and voracious consumers of the Indies' wealth. They also blur the barrier between Self and Other as the monstrosity and barbarity of the Indians comes to resemble that of the Spaniards both in their descriptions of them at their arrival, and in their sinful actions throughout the rest of the play.

Lope gives dramatic importance to the Indians' perception of the Spaniards in these scenes to offer comic relief to his audience, who would have found these images amusing in their absurdity; and also to give a voice to the Indian interpretation of events, showing how the Spanish explorers are viewed by the Other. With this re-ordering, as Soufas says, "The easily drawn binaries of other/same, material/spiritual, and villain/hero are destabilized such that the

[93] For more on monstrous birth, see Huet and Río Parra.

signs Indian and Spaniard in this drama also refuse participation in the simplicity of binary opposition" (320). Using the Indian perspective and characterizing the Spaniards as moral monsters, Lope demonstrates that during the conquest the boundaries between Other and Self dissipate, as the Spanish display similar monstrous characteristics to those typically ascribed to the Indians. The Other, in the form of the Moor and the Jew during the Reconquest, and the Indian of the Conquest, was key to the identity construction of the newly unified Spain under the Catholic monarchs. Lope interpreted this story for the stage because it spoke to concerns about Spanish identity that circulated in his time as Castile sought to build an image of a unified, Catholic, Castilian Spain. The story of the conquest justifies and glorifies the vision of Spain the monarchs sought to project. At the same time Lope also subverts this official ideology and, through morally monstrous characters, questions the legitimacy of the methods of conquest by imagining the Spanish conquerors as disordered monsters that violently devour a people, their riches, and their women, in the name of God.

El nuevo mundo illustrates the conquest of the New World as an expansion of the Reconquest and as evidence of a unified, powerful, and Christian Spain, while at once subtly criticizing the methods of the conquest. *Las batuecas del duque de Alba* also provides a dramatic interpretation of the completion of Spain's Reconquest, this time through the accidental "discovery" of the *batuecos*, a long-lost people living in Spain who are supposedly descendants of the Visigoth King Rodrigo who, according to legend, caused Spain's fall to the Moors in 711.[94] Additionally, the conquest and conversion of the *batuecos* mimics the conquest and

[94] According to Pedro de Corral's *Crónica sarracina*, later published and widely circulated as *Crónica del Rey don Rodrigo, postrimero rey de los godos* (1499), the story is as follows: King Rodrigo, Count Julian, and the Archbishop Oppas were the three most powerful men in the Iberian Peninsula, and seemed unassailable in early eighth century Toledo, the seat of the Visigothic kingdom. Individually, they controlled the three key institutions: the government, the

conversion continuing to happen in the New World at the time the play is premiered, speaking to the debates that continued to swirl about Spain's activities in the New World. This play also dramatizes the building of an image of Spain that projected the characteristics of power, purity, Catholicism, and dynastic legitimacy. Lope includes moral monsters in this play to show how immorality caused Spain's fall to Islam and whose repercussions continue into the seventeenth century; and to depict the immorality of two people who run away to consummate an illicit love affair against the wishes of the Duque de Alba and find themselves becoming uncomfortably similar to their morally monstrous and barbaric hosts.

In the play two lovers, Don Juan and Brianda have married in secret and flee the house of the Duke of Alba so they can be together. On their way to Portugal, they find a harsh and inaccessible mountain range that surrounds a series of valleys that are inhabited by savages, the *batuecos*. Throughout the play, the *batuecos* are indicated to be descendents of the *godos*, who

---

military, and the emerging Christian Church. They had imperial dreams for Spain and desired the growth of Christianity. One day, against the counsel of his advisors, Rodrigo entered the House of Hercules, an enchanted edifice, a sin of hubris and greed, to try to find treasures within. Inside he discovered an ark, containing a parchment with drawing of men with beards and turbans ad a prophecy, which said whoever broke into the house would lose his kingdom to people like those on the parchment. Rodrigo sealed the house and swore his advisors to secrecy. Count Julian entrusted his only daughter, La Cava, to Rodrigo's court while he remained in the North African Berber Community. Rodrigo became enchanted by La Cava's beauty, until he could not contain his lust for her any longer, and he raped her. La Cava told her father what happened, and to avenge his daughter, Count Julian conspired with the Muslim groups of North Africa who had longed to conquer Spain, to attack. In the year 711, between July 19 and 23, the Muslims invaded southern Spain. Rodrigo's army was slaughtered, and some say he escaped wearing a shepherd's clothing to live out his days in penitence. Meanwhile, the Jews opened Toledo to the Muslims, and the Christian, Gothic nation fell to Islam. In the mountains of Asturias, between 718-722, refugees from the defeated Visigothic kingdom decided to fight back. A Gothic nobleman named Pelayo, possibly a relative of King Rodrigo, and a small band of followers and the help of God and the Virgin Mary, went to Covadonga. They drew a line in a cave, beyond which the Muslims could not advance. This event launched the beginning of the Christian Restoration, or Reconquest, which sought to recover Spain from the Muslims, for Christianity. For more on the legends of Spain's history, see Grieve.

fled to the valleys when Don Rodrigo lost Spain to the Africans. These savages, the *batuecos*, lived alone in the valleys, "sin ley, sin Rey, sin Dios ni orden político," unaware they were not alone in the world (III, 929). Don Juan and Brianda live among them, along with Mendo, Don Juan's servant. Brianda lives dressed as a man, "Celio," and becomes their king. She and Don Juan teach them about the outside world, particularly about the Duke of Alba, the kingdom of Spain, and the one true God. They erect crosses to make the devil, who had previously possessed the valley, run away. After a series of events, the lovers leave the valleys and inform the Duke of Alba about the small new world and its inhabitants. The Duke pardons the lovers and takes possession of the valleys. The play ends when the two lovers, the *batuecos*, and the peasants from surrounding villages come together in the Peña de Francia so the Duke can serve as the godfather of the *batuecos* in their baptism.

Don Juan and Brianda's secret marriage would have been considered a grave moral offense by Lope's audience, given that the Council of Trent increased the participation of the Church in the organization of marriages and invalidated secret marriages.[95] Don Juan tells Mendo that his father served the previous Conde de Alba, Don Fernando de Toledo, and that they both died in battle, leaving Don Juan in the care of Don Fernando de Toledo's son, Don García de Toledo, who is now the Duque de Alba. In spite of his loyalty to the Duque, who is

[95] The *Decree on the Reformation of Marriage* of the Council of Trent reads: "the holy Church of God has, for most just reasons, at all times detested and prohibited [clandestine marriages]…therefore…it ordains that, for the future, before a marriage is contracted, it shall three times be accounced publicly in the church, by the proper parish priest of the contracting parties, during the solemnization of mass, on three continuous festival days, between whom marriage is to be celebrated; after which banns being published, if there be no lawful impediment opposed, the marriage shall proceed with the face of the church…the marriage shall be celebrated in the presence of the parish priest, and of two or three witnesses…Those who shall attempt to contract marriages otherwise than in the presence of the parish priest, or of some other priest by permission of the said parish priest, or of the ordinary, and in the presence of two or three witnesses; them doth the holy synod render utterly incapable of thus contracting, and declares such contracts void and null…" (179-181).

like a father to him, Don Juan marries Brianda in secret while the Duque is away in Castilla. Don Juan says he "Vime ya mozo y galán, y el oficio y galas nuevas/ me dieron atrevimiento/ para pretender con ellas/ a una doncella de casa,/ hermosa, noble, y discreta,/ y a pesar de la lealtad,/ estoy casado con ella … No digo que la he gozado, pero esta noche intenta/ entrar por aquellas tapias/ a las puertas de esta huerta…" and they will run away under the veil of nighttime (I, 869-870). Based on Don Juan's story, it appears that, young and in love, he decided to pursue a young lady of the Duque de Alba's house, Brianda. Despite his allegiance to the Duque, Don Juan and Brianda marry without the consent of the Duque or the presence of witnesses. They plan to run away to consummate their marriage and to avoid the wrath of their lord. The audience assumes they consummate their marriage while hiding out in the mountains among the *batuecos*, as later in the play we find Brianda with child. This quote shows that Don Juan knows that by marrying Brianda in secret and running away with her, he offends the Duque's authority and also the norms around marriage of his time, which required parental permission, a preists's public apprival and blessing, and witnesses.

The Council of Trent definitively banned secret marriages in Chapter I of the "Decree on the Reformation of Marriage" from its Session XXIV on November 2, 1563 (179-182). Even though the play is set around 1492, it would have been performed in the early seventeenth century (as it was written between 1598-1600 and published in 1638) and thus the audience would have viewed this secret marriage based on the Council of Trent's teachings: as illicit.[96]

[96] In Spain, the regulations put forth by the Council of Trent were enforced with special emphasis on paternal consent, as reflected in Juan de Ávila's chapters on the Council of Trent in his "Advertencias al Concilio de Toledo" (1565-1566). Parental consent, in fact, was required for marriage until the 19th century, as we can see in petitions during the courts of Madrid (1579, 1586-1588) and in the twenty laws of the Title II, Book X of the *Novísima recopilación de las leyes de España*. For more on secret matrimony in Spain, see Aznar Gil 173; Usunáriz 293-312; and Campo Guinea 180-201. On the topic of secret matrimony in Europe, see Ozment.

The Council of Trent emphasized that marriage should only be contracted between two consenting people, but it also said that marriages had to be contracted in the presence of the appropriate parish priest and two or three witnesses, or else it was considered invalid. Furthermore, children who contracted marriage without their parents' consent also invalidated the marriage. Other rules outlined in this section include that before the consummation of the marriage, it must be made public in the church; and the married couple should not live together until they have had received the sacerdotal benediction, which must also be received in the church. Finally, the couple to be married must first confess their sins and take communion. Since Don Juan contracts marriage without the permission of his lord, who is also like his father; and because he and Brianda are not married by a priest; have no witnesses; have not received communion; and live together and consummate their marriage without a benediction, confession, or communion; their marriage is invalid. Their actions are an immoral offense against the Church's teachings and also go against their allegiance to the Duque de Alba, who, though not Don Juan's real father, is still his lord and does not give him the "parental" consent to marry.

Don Juan and Brianda's story of illicit love and disobedience echoes the story of Rodrigo and his forbidden desire for La Cava. According to the legend, Rodrigo lusts after La Cava and eventually rapes her. This angers her father, the Count Julian, who gathers Muslim troops from North Africa to attack Rodrigo and his army. They defeat Rodrigo, who escapes to the wilderness to avoid further punishment, but from then on Rodrigo's lust for La Cava is associated with the fall of Spain to Islam in 711. The *Demonio* corroborates this story in his monologue in Act II, in which he says he has enjoyed prosperous fortune in the valley for around 600 years, "cuando Rodrigo,/ por una loca hermosura/ rindió la mísera España/ a la africana coyunda … mujer me dio grande parte/ de España" (II, 901). Because of La Cava's beauty,

Rodrigo fell to sin and caused Spain's fall to Islam. In *Las batuecas*, Don Juan's love for Brianda causes his fall to sin and disobedience, as well. Don Juan explains how he prefers to escape to the sierra with Brianda rather than follow the Duque's wishes: "Bien sé que es grande el peligro/ mas si me meto en la sierra,/ junto a la Peña de Francia,/ defenderánme sus peñas;/ que aunque sepa, hecho salvaje,/ vivir con Brianda entre ellas/ la tendré por mejor vida/ que de los Duques la mesa" (I, 870). Knowing he will have to go out into the wild in order to be with Brianda, he prefers the danger and degradation of that life with her to a life of civilization without her. He says to Brianda, "Amor nos quiera guiar;/ pero no sabrá, que es ciego./ Hacia la Peña de Francia/ habemos de ir" (I, 872). Blind, illicit love is what leads them to go out into the mountains, abandoning their civilized and moral life at the court. Like Rodrigo, Don Juan's prohibited desire for a woman leads him to the wild to lose his identity as civilized, moral, and virtuous Spaniard, just as Rodrigo's lust for a beautiful woman caused the loss of Spain's Christian identity and that of his descendants. With the victory of the North African army in 711, Spain became a Moorish stronghold, replacing its Christian character with an Islamic one.

The change in identity Rodrigo causes is reflected in Lope's depiction of the *batuecos*, Rodrigo's descendants, as uncivilized monsters that lack knowledge of Christian teachings.[97]

[97] Several references in the play point to the *batuecos* as descendants of the ancient Visigoths. For example Brianda says, "Sin duda sois castellanos/ de la perdición de España/ que huyendo los Africanos/ cerrados desta montaña/ habitáis en estos llanos" (II, 887-888). She adds upon accepting the offer to be their King, "Bien está,/ digo que quiero ser rey,/ que fue vuestro origen ya./ Que en sólo ese gran deseo,/ que fueron cristianos veo/ los hombres de quin venís" (II, 889). Don Juan recapitulates the story of Rodrigo and Count Julian when Brianda tells him whom she's found (II, 893-894). El *Demonio*, in an extensive monologue, mentions that he has prospered in the valley for about 600 years, from the time of Don Rodrigo to the reign of Isabel, and now leaves the valley to the Duque de Alba because Christ has arrived with Don Juan and Brianda (II, 901). The fortuitous discovery of Don Rodrigo's nephew Teodosilio also connects the *batuecos* to Rodrigo. In a final example, all the characters comment on their bloodline as they are turned over to the Duque de Alba. Don Juan says, "Ves aquí aquestas reliquias,/ ya de los

The play opens with Taurina and Giroto, two *batuecos*, dressed in animal skins as archetypal "wild men and women": Taurina displays "los cabellos sueltos, unas pieles por vestidos" and Giroto also dons "melena y pieles" (I, 851).[98] In fact, all of the *batuecos* enter the stage wearing "pieles toscas" with either "melena corta" or "cabello suelto" (for instance, I, 853, 858, 859). The crude, unrefined costumes described in the stage directions tell the audience how isolated the *batuecos* have been from civilization, and that idea is reinforced with the *bastones* the *batueco*s carry about in place of the more modern and sophisticated sword. In addition, their costume also indicates the effect of Rodrigo's sins on their identity. The *batuecos* appearance as a primitive, animal-like people is due to Rodrigo's lust, as the *salvaje* costume was associated with sexual appetite, like that of their Visigoth ancestor.[99] Other, more civilized characters from outside the valley also see them as monsters and barbarians. For example, Brianda exclaims upon meeting Mileno, "¡Qué bárbaro tan extraño!" and "¡Qué serrano tan feroz!" (I, 877-878). As Mileno carries her away she shouts, "Don Juan, que un monstruo me lleva!" (I, 878). The vocabulary she uses in reference to the *batuecos–bárbaro, serrano, monstruo*–points out the barbarianism of the *batuecos*. Their monstrosity is the visual manifestation of the effects that Rodrigo's immoral actions had on his direct descendants.

The *Demonio* character in the play also communicates the *batuecos*' lost Christianity and inherited immorality, their identity transformation from Christian to monster. The Devil enters the stage dressed "en forma de sátiro, media máscara hasta la boca, con cuernos; hasta la cintura,

---

godos de España./ Éstos son los descendientes/ de aquellos que la habitaban/ cuando la perdió Rodrigo/ por amores de la Cava" (III, 936).

[98] For more on the wild man, see Mazur (1966), Antonucci, and Husband.

[99] As mentioned earlier, the animal skins and savage dress associate the characters with unbridled sexual appetite. See Egido (1995) 40.

un desnudillo de cuero blanco, y de la cintura a los pies, de piel, a hechura de cabrón, como le pintan" (II, 901).[100] In other words, the Devil appears on stage as a half-human, half-goat, demonic creature, a monstrous mixture of human, animal, and demon.[101] The aesthetic of the Devil as a satyr recalls the audience of lust, like the lascivious Roman gods of the woods.[102] By depicting the Devil this way, Lope can connect his presence with the fall of Spain to Muslims as a result of Rodrigo's lust for La Cava. Lust allows the Devil to enter the valley, and consequently evil and carnal desire rule over the *bateucos* in their isolated valley.

The visual effect of the Devil is also to connect his identity to that of the *batuecos*. Both the *batuecos* and the Devil appear on stage dressed in animal skins, linking them and their immorality visually. In the third act, Belardo describes the *batueco* he has seen as "algún demonio acaso,/ que os quisiere engañar y descindiros," verbally connecting the Devil and the *batuecos* (III, 912). Lope creates the visual and audible association between the satyr-like Devil and the *batuecos* to show how they lost their Christian roots and became lusting, sinful, pagan monsters. We find one example of the *batuecos*' sinful and lustful existence among the erotic love triangle between Taurina, Mileno, and Brianda/Celio.[103] The verbal and aesthetic similarity

[100] This monstrous version of the Devil was not the kind of Devil Lope's audience was accustomed to seeing, as González Fernández demonstrates; the Devil rarely appears on stage as a satyr in Spanish Golden Age theater (115).

[101] See, for example, Paré's definition of monsters and marvels: "Monstres sont choses qui apparaissent outre le cours de Nature (et sont le plus souvent signes de quelque malheur à advenir) comme un enfant qui naist avec un seul bras, un autre qui aura deux testes, et autres membres outre l'ordinaire. Prodiges, ce sont choses qui viennent du tout contre Nature, comme une femme qui enfantera un serpent, ou un chien, ou autre chose du tout contre Nature" (304).

[102] Covarrubias tells us the *sátiro* is "un género de monstruos, o verdaderos, o fingidos" that symbolizes "mucha luxuria," (1290).

[103] See, for instance, I, 877; and III, 916-917.

between the Devil and the *batuecos* shows that the *batuecos'* identity is immoral because they lack Christianity and only have the lustful Satan as their God.

Don Juan and Brianda's lust leads to their loss of identity, as well. Brianda offers a distinct picture of their initial civilized "Spanishness" when she describes her world to them for the first time. As the *batuecos* explain to her that they have never heard of the Duque de Alba, Fernando, God, or even Spain, Brianda defines each concept briefly to them. She clarifies that Spain is much bigger than the valley of the *batuecos*, with many more people. Spain is only one part of the world, but there exists "otro mundo segundo/ que va a descubrir Colón," referring to Spain's efforts to expand its empire (II, 885). When asked what all the people do together, Brianda answers, "Entienden/ cada cual en su ejercicio,/ que unos de los otros penden" (II, 886). In other words, society is a hierarchy, and each person has his or her station in society, and his or her particular role to perform–and each one is necessary. In Spain, there is a king, "Fernando, español,/ vuestro rey . . . El rey de España" (II, 885). The King's responsibility is to be the "supremo oficio . . . Este Rey premia y castiga,/ defiende el mal, paga el bien" (II, 886). The enemy of the king is the Moor, "de ley contraria" (II, 886). Spain also has laws, which Brianda describes as "La fe que adoro;" and adds that "la fe" is "Cosa necesaria para salvarse" (II, 886). Only "El buen cristiano" can be saved, which is he who follows the laws of Christ, the Supreme God (II, 886). Finally, she explains the difference between the two types kings: Christ is the "divino Rey" while the King is "Rey humano" (II, 886-887). This picture of Spain as a Christian, monarchical, ordered, expanding empire contrasts with the world of the *batuecos*, who live in a small valley among only 200 or so of their own people, have no societal structure, no king, are ruled by Satan, and are ignorant of laws, Christian faith, or salvation.

At first, the Spaniards in *Las batuecas* are depicted as Christian, civilized people who teach, convert, and subjugate the *batuecos*. For example, Don Juan says it seems that God himself placed he and Brianda in the valley to save the batuecos: "parece que el cielo . . . quiere que estos castellanos,/ sepan que perdidos van./ Y no sin causa ha querido/ que nos hayamos perdido,/ para ganar estas gentes,/ de cuerpos y almas presentes,/ al cielo y al Duque ofendido" (II, 894). Don Juan and Brianda are convinced that their discovery of the "lost" *batuecos* is part of a divine plan to win the bodies and souls of the barbarians for the Duque and God. And later, the Duque tells the Mayordomo that "como a cristiano caballero . . . he de bajar yo mismo a ver el valle,/ y reducir a esta perdida gente/ a Dios, a rey y a ley y a orden política" (III, 929). It is his Christian duty, he exclaims, to subjugate the lost tribe to Spain's religious, political, and social order. These motives, like those used to justify the Conquest of the Indies and the Inquisition, would seem warranted according to the dominant ideology of the time period.

However, as Don Juan, Brianda, and Mendo spend more time living among the *batuecos*, they, too, become indistinguishable from these moral monsters. For instance, some villagers describe a monster they have seen in the mountains, who in reality is Don Juan dressed as a *batueco*:

Belardo:	Verdad digo, y que subiendo al monte mi ganado . . . vi a la sombra de un verde cabrahígo, un monstruo, un hombre, un animal sentado.
Lucindo:	¿Animal, monstruo, y hombre; ¿de qué modo?
Belardo:	Porque me pareció que lo era todo. (III, 911)

Belardo explains that the creature he has spotted in the mountains is an ambiguous one, a being who could be a man, maybe a goat, or a monster; it's hard to say. Don Juan has become less like the Spanish man he was at the beginning of the play, and more like a monstrous mixture of that man and a moral monster. Don Juan and Brianda live to be with one another in defiance of the

Duque de Alba's authority, prioritizing their illicit love for one another over political and societal order. Their newly monstrous appearance is not just a result of the time they have spent living in the valley, but is also the visual manifestation of a their immorality and disobedience.

Brianda, Don Juan, and Mendo even begin to self-identify as one of the *batuecos*. In the third act, they enter the stage "vestidos de bárbaros" (III, 913). Their conversation reveals the meaning of their new style of dress:

> Don Juan: Bárbaros estamos ya.
> Brianda: Hasta el alma lo parece.
> Don Juan: Ya no hay vestido ni cosa de las que habemos traído.
> Brianda: Conforma al alma el vestido. (III, 913)

Their dress is indicative of their new identity as *bárbaros*; not just externally, but "hasta el alma," or morally.[104] Lope shows here that Don Juan and Brianda's change in identity is linked to a change in their souls. Because they live according to selfish, lustful desires that defy political norms of obedience to hierarchy and religious norms around marriage, they begin to resemble the same barbaric, uncivilized people among whom they live. The lack of material connection to their old way of life is symbolic of the lack of spiritual connection, as well. Brianda laments, "siento el vivir como fiera,/ sin Dios, sin iglesia y ley" (III, 914). In their new, dehumanized identity, Brianda and Don Juan no longer conform to Spanish ways of life, ordered by God, the Church, and laws. They have thus become a monstrous, animal-like, disordered Other.

Mendo, Don Juan's friend and servant, has also experienced a total change of identity parallel to that of his friend. Out of loyalty to Don Juan, he has stayed with Don Juan and Brianda in the valley of the *batuecos*. Like his master, he enters the stage in the third act "vestido de bárbaro con pieles y abarcas" (III, 920). Don Juan comments on the totality of Mendo's

[104] For more on the notion of the soul as the organizing force of the body, as key to the essence of a being, see Aristotle.

transformation: “y hasta el mismo ser trocara” (III, 914). Mendo has not just changed his clothes, but has also taken on a new sense of self, a new savage “ser,” by living outside the laws of God or the King. The civilized Spaniards’ physical and spiritual transformation is reminiscent of the Spanish loss to the Moors, its physical loss of territory as well as its spiritual conversion from Christian to Islamic.

Lope reiterates the monstrous immorality of Don Juan, Brianda and Mendo by showing it has become difficult for the world outside of the *batuecos*’ valley to determine if they are monsters or not. For example, Mendo hears Lucindo say to the other villagers, “¡Notable deseo/ topar un monstruo de aquéstos!” and Mendo realizes, “De nosotros hablan éstos” (III, 922). Mendo acknowledges that he, Don Juan, and Brianda are no longer recognizable, and are now considered part of the morally monstrous Other. The other villagers also tell stories of seeing monsters. Belardo says that the monster he saw (in reality, Don Juan) has given him nightmares ever since: “Es cosa de tanto espanto,/ que desde entonces lo sueño” (III, 923). Don Juan inspires the same fear in the villagers that he felt upon initially encountering the *batuecos*. Mendo is also mistaken for a monster when he runs off to warn his friends they are being hunted. Lucindo spots him and asks, “¿Es monstruo aquel que va allí?” And as the villagers discuss what to do, Belardo asserts, “Hierve de monstruos el monte” (III, 923). The mountains, they are sure, must be full of monsters, showing how threatened the villagers feel by them. The once-civilized Spaniards have become *monstruos batuecos* and frighten and threaten the villagers because in their savage state, they threaten the harmony and order of civilization.

In a comical twist of events, the villagers Belardo, Lucindo and Valerio become so obsessed with hunting and killing the *monstruos* of the mountains that they are unable to distinguish between the monsters and the Duque de Alba himself. When the villagers encounter

the Duque, Ramiro, and the Mayordomo during their hunt, Belardo mistakes the group for monsters, exclaiming, "¡Qué de monstruos han venido!" (III, 924). Their genuine confusion is evident when Belardo and Lucindo ask the Duque and his men *seven* times if they are monsters. The confusion, it seems, stems from the desire to find what they are looking for. Belardo and Lucindo explain that "hemos venido a matar monstruos" because "Supimos/ que en los peñascos mayores/ deste monte andan a caza/ de hombres, y hemos hecho gente" (III, 925). They are hunting for monsters, and they are determined to find them. Ironically, without realizing it, Lucindo and company are doing the same thing they think the monsters are doing: hunting men. The monsters they seek to find and kill are actually men, including Don Juan, Brianda, Mendo, and the rest of the *batuecos*, who are not real monsters, but rather moral monsters who live as barbarians.

Brianda has the most complex identity transformation of all, because she not only becomes like a morally monstrous *batueco*, but also dresses and acts as a man. To conceal her identity during her escape with Don Juan, Brianda dresses in *hábito de hombre*, which she is still wearing when she meets the *batuecos* for the first time. Throughout the play, she is known as a man by the name of Celio, and as the newly instated "king" of the *batuecos*. While pretending to be both a man and King, Brianda/Celio gives birth to a son she conceived with Don Juan while in hiding. To rationalize this curious event to the *batuecos*, Brianda and Don Juan try to convince them, especially Taurina who is in love with Celio, that in their land men give birth every seven years (III, 929). Taurina reasons they are telling the truth by saying, "¿El gallo non pone un huevo?/ ¿La liebre no es femba y macho?" (III, 930). This comparison to hermaphroditic animals shows that Taurina accepts Brianda/Celio and other men from the "outside world" of Spain as hermaphrodites, which was considered a kind of monstrosity in early modern Spain because they

were difficult to classify, and as such problematical to include in society.[105] Brianda's monstrously amalgam identity is the most out of order of all the characters: she is at once civilized and barbarian, woman and man, human and animal, wise instructor of Spain's glorious character and also deceptive to achieve her own agenda. She represents Spain's liminal character after its loss to Islam as a conglomeration of religions and political entities that, like Brianda, had to eventually be restored to order.

Lope's connection of the stories of Rodrigo and La Cava, the *batuecos*, and Don Juan and Brianda serves two primary functions: first, to dramatize how immorality caused Spain's fall to Islam and consequent loss of identity; and second, to show the connection and continuity between seventeenth century Spaniards and their Visigoth ancestors.[106] Regarding the first, Rodrigo's sins of lust and disobedience cause a loss of Spain's identity and that of the *batuecos* who should have become Spain's pure, Visigoth, Christian ancestors but instead become uninitialized, animal-like devil-worshippers. Don Juan and Brianda's transgressive love and disobedience of the Duque causes their own loss of identity through a process of dehumanization that symbolizes their moral monstrosity.

---

[105] Hermaphrodites were viewed as monsters initially because they were seen as portents of the coming evil that would befall an entire nation; after the second half of the sixteenth century, they were seen as monsters more because of the difficulty of ascribing a particular identity to them, and because as such they were difficult to include in society (Río Parra, *Una era de monstruos* 87-88). Fray Antonio Fuentelapeña explains in Duda XI of his *El ente dilucidado: discurso único novissi[m]o q[ue] muestra ay en natural[ez]a animales irracionales e invicibles, y quales sean*: "aunque los hermafroditas son monstruos, como se probó en su lugar, pero dicha monstruosidad no es sobre las fuerzas de la naturaleza, ni se dize monstruosa por otra causa, que por extraviarse de lo ordinario, y que ordinariamente sucede en los demas hombres" (63).

[106] Spain had heightened anxiety about the credibility of its Christian past at it continued to struggle against Islam in the sixteenth century. On the negotiation of identity and difference through cultural mimesis between Christian Spaniards and Moors, see Fuchs Chapter 3.

The second function is related to an important part of the historiography movement in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in Spain: the resurrection of the neo-Visigoth myth, which had largely disappeared during the fourteenth century.[107] A key tenet of seventeenth-century political thought was that the image of a country was not just important for a country's appearance of strength and health, but to its actual strength and health. Saavaedra Fajardo expresses a common view of contemporary Spanish political theorists when he writes, "Y así en no estando la corona fixa sobre esta columna derecha de la reputación, dará en tierra" (205).[108] In other words, he says that without the reputation of power, the Crown would not be able to retain its real power.

One of the ways Spain tried to create this image of strength, influence, and legitimacy was through giving new life to its Visigoth past. Scholars who reinvigorated this part of Spain's past insisted on the continuity between the primitive Visigoth kings and the present monarchs in order to underscore the extent and duration of the Spanish kingdom, and especially that of Castile. The neo-Visigoth legend had served since the early Middle Ages as fundamental proof of dynastic legitimacy and it continued in that role through the Golden Age period. In fact, the Visigoth legend became so entrenched in the early modern Spanish imagination that the words "godo" and "noble" became interchangeable (Case, "Some Observations" 72). As Fernández Abaladejo concludes, "el goticismo pudo consolidarse … como núcleo identidario de lo hispano" (2007, 302). The neo-Visigoth was revived and popularized as a critical element of Spanish national identity in early modern Spain.

---

[107] Works by the Bishop of Burgos, Alfonso de Cartagena, and his disciple, Sánchez de Arévalo, reanimate the insistence on the Visigoth connection by other writers. See Catalán 38-42 and Tate 90.

[108] On the importance of reputation to Spain's power, see Elliot (1989) 162-164.

By becoming more like the *batuecos*, Don Juan and Brianda become more like their Visigoth ancestors, the direct, descendants of Rodrigo. As Mileno says, though Brianda is "home del otro mundo . . . Non somos tan desemejantes," referencing their shared ancestry (II, 883). However, the *batuecos*, like Don Juan, Brianda, and Mendo, are in reality a deformed, immoral version of the ideal ancestral Spaniards. Though the *batuecos* are pureblooded, direct descendants of the Visigoth King Rodrigo, their monstrosity is a result of the loss of the key ideal characteristic: their Christianity. Because of Rodrigo's lust and because of their long isolation from Christianity and civilization, these spiritually and socially distorted relics from Spain's past must be recovered and restored through conversion, civilization, and integration into the dominant order.

The restoration of order in the play comes with the baptism and re-assimilation of the monster into the dominant order and identity of Spain. The *batuecos,* relics of Spain's past and "claros ascendientes" or pure, Old Christian ancestors, are given as vassals to the Duque de Alba who baptizes them (III, 937). Don Juan, Brianda, and Mendo are pardoned for their offenses and are welcomed back into the Duque's territory because they brought him new vassals and restored an eminent part of Spain's past.

The restoring of order at the end of the play echoes the ending of the Reconquest. Don Juan, realizing he has to turn himself in, wants to bring the *batuecos* to the Duque himself to use them as a bargaining chip to escape punishment for running off with Brianda. To convince the Duque he should not personally go after the lost people, Don Juan warns him that conquering the *batuecos* will not be as decisive as the recent victory over the Moors because of the difficult terrain, and asks the Duque to allow him to bring the vassals to him instead: "Conquistan los dos Reyes a Granada,/ su vega corren y sus moros vence;/ más ésta, de montaña coronada,/ jamás

acabará lo que comience" (III, 934). When Don Juan brings the *batuecos* to the Duque de Alba, it is as if the Duque's own Reconquest, and that of all of Spain, is now complete. The monstrous *batuecos,* Spaniards who had lost their Christianity and thus their Spanish identity, are converted, have their identity restored, and no longer threaten the valley or contaminate Christian Spain. As J.M. Rozas writes, "Queda claro el perfecto entramado temático del planteamiento de algunos hombres, los godos que huyeron de los árabes y que quedaron, hasta perder su identidad, aislados, viviendo según la naturaleza, pero con una oscura intuición de que habían de entrar – volver – a la historia de España" (313). Lope frames the story of the *batuecos* such that he tells the circular story of their loss, discovery, conversion, and return to Spain's history. Their discovery, conversion, and assimilation denotes the closing of the chapter in Spain's history that included Rodrigo's sins and Spain's fall to Islam: in effect, the completion of the Reconquest. As Vega Ramos explains, this ending is symbolic:

> Los batuecos, gente hidalga, y reliquias vivas de los godos, son hallados cuando Fernando toma Granada: la recuperación de la perdida gente coincida con la expulsión de los Moros Africanos, y ambas cosas están acomunadas – son sucesos complementarios – por ser conquistas que restituyen una sentida 'unidad' nacional y reparan la pérdida de España. (177)

In other words, the Duque now has, in a sense, his own Granada, because Spain's unification under Christianity has also been completed. This event in the play, in which the last remnants of evil have finally been found and brought into the dominant religious order, also mirrors and exalts the Duque de Alba's real-life role in Guerra de Granada and the city's surrender.

With this play Lope exploits contemporary interest in Spain's Visigoth history to tell an entertaining official and also subversive version of the story of Spain's past and present by juxtaposing the ancestral *batuecos* with fifteenth-century Spaniards Don Juan and Brianda. In this play, Lope speaks to the movement that breathed new life into Spain's Visigoth past by

dramatizing the story of the *batuecos*, a long-lost, pure-blooded Visigoth people that were simply forgotten for a time and had to be brought back into the order of the civilized fold, reminding his audience of Spain's illustrious and well-founded past. For instance, the Duque says, "Amigos, mi nombre ensalza/ más el ser vuestro señor/ que la gran tierra heredad/ de los claros ascendientes/ que dan principio a mi casa" (III, 935). Taking the *batuecos* as vassals means that noble, pure, Visigoth blood has been added to Spain, linking it to its Visigoth roots and underlining the purity and eminence of Spain's history and its implications of power in the present.

However, at the same time, Lope pokes fun at Spain's obsession with its past by depicting these descendants of Rodrigo as monstrous hybrids, as the original, noble, Old Christian Spaniards who, forgotten since the Moorish victory in 711, are also uncivilized, immoral, and pagan barbarians. Lope brings up the fact that Rodrigo, the Visigoth King often depicted as Spain's preeminent link to a legitimate dynasty, was at once a founding father of Spanish-ness and also the character whose sins caused the fall of Spain to Islam and the arrival of dehumanizing evil to the valley of the *batuecos*. Furthermore, Lope uses the *batueco*s' story to subtly criticize a Spain so intent on discovering new worlds and expanding the empire outwardly that they forgot to pay attention to their own interior, leaving their own Visigoth ancestors to live lawless and God-less. Lope therefore glorifies Spain's past through its link to Visigoth ancestry while interrogating the idealization of Spain's past by showing how sin and religious, social, and political disorder jeopardized Spain's strength and preeminence, perhaps offering food for thought as to how Spain should not proceed as it continued to construct its reputation and its empire. With this quasi-historical account, Lope demonstrates his own version of Spain's ideal past, present, and future.

The moral monsters in this play serve to link past and present Spain and to highlight the continuity of Spain's monarchical dynasty, and also the continuity of sin from Spain's inception to its current state. Ironically and comically, the "civilized" Spaniards who accidentally discover and convert the uncivilized *batuecos* become moral monsters just like them. They demonstrate the same frailty to lust and illicit desire that Rodrigo did six hundred years prior. The moral monster is found not just in the undiscovered and pagan peoples hiding away in unknown lands; it is within Spain, as well, as evidenced by Spain's Inquisitorial practices that especially targeted religious converts. The moral monsters also show that Spaniards in Lope's time continued to struggle, as humans have throughout history, with their human frailty to sin and its repercussions for social, political, and religious identity. In the past, Rodrigo's sin meant the fall of Spain to religious disorder through Islamic victory; in the fifteenth century in which the play is set, it meant political disorder in the disobedience of the Duque, religious disorder in a life without God and the Church to order it, and social disorder in the illicit union of two lovers.

Using morally monstrous characters in both *El nuevo mundo* and *Las batuecas,* Lope dramatizes stories from Spain's past to offer his own unique vision of the construction of Spain's national identity through conquest. In *El nuevo mundo*, Lope dramatizes how the Indians view the Spaniards, as frightening monsters who are portents of their impending salvation/destruction. He also uses monster imagery to subtly critique the violence associated with the conversion and subjugation of the Indians. In *Las batuecas*, Lope creates morally monstrous characters to dramatize Spain's loss of identity as the result of Rodrigo's lust, and also the restoration of its perhaps not-so-morally-pure identity through the (re)conquest of its own lost people.

It must be noted that some scholars would disagree with this reading of the plays. Soufas argues that plays like *El nuevo mundo* and *Las batuecas*, should be read using the paradigm of

the anticonquest, defined by Pratt as "whereby European bourgeois subjects seek to secure their innocence in the same moment they assert European hegemony" (7). Using this paradigm, each conquest and how it is carried out should be viewed as part and parcel of the divine plan, and thus the excesses and errors of the conquerors should be interpreted positively, as unavoidable consequences or collateral effects of God's design (Soufas 326). However, Castañeda argues that if Soufas is correct in saying the discourse of the anticonquest serves as part of the official rhetoric that legitimizes the conquest's ideology, then the problem with interpreting Lope's play with this paradigm is that Lope's play is not an official text, but a text in which Lope "reflexiona críticamente sobre los mitos propagados por el estado" (45). Castañeda's reading of the plays rings true, I argue, if one closely examines the monstrous characters in each play. Each appearance of the monster on stage creates a liminal space in which Lope can dramatize the complexity of an encounter, the gray areas of morality, and the intricacies of Spain's national history. Lauer (1993) agrees, "there is an official 'party line' as far as these plays are concerned; but, surprisingly, there are also multiple decentering strategies which in effect partially destabilize or challenge the official ideological component of these dramas" (34). These plays use monstrosity not only to entertain the *vulgo* with their unusual costumes, frightening behavior and tension-creating difference; but also to decenter the official version of Spain's history to show an alternative version of the events, from a different angle that implicates Spain's own efforts as morally monstrous at the same time it legitimizes them. The moral monster is the barbaric Other, but it is also the Spaniard who falls to sin, especially greed and lust, causing at times the same or increased disorder as the barbarian.

During a time when Spain sought to create a powerful and legitimate reputation while continuing to battle its own religious Other at home, *El nuevo mundo descubierto por Cristóbal*

Colón and *Las batuecas del duque de Alba* serve as part of the written and oral cultural production that exalted and propagated the image of Spain as a unified, powerful, legitimate empire. They also speak to contemporary concerns about how that collective identity was being created, and at what moral cost. The monstrous characters in these plays interrogate the official versions of Spain's history to show how Spain also had a past tarnished by sin as a result of human frailty, threatening the very political, religious, and social order it was seeking to establish. In conclusion, Lope creates morally monstrous characters to reveal that Spanish national self-fashioning can only truly be achieved when more than one version of the national history is told, and when all the voices of its characters – even the monsters – can be heard. He exposes the shortsightedness of constructing a collective self-image defined only by the conquering, assimilating, or excluding of the monster, because in these stories from Spain's past, the monstrous Other can also be the Self.

Conclusion

> "Desta suerte iban discurriendo, cuando interrumpió su filosofar otro monstruo, aunque no lo extrañaron, porque en este mundo no se topa sino una monstruosidad tras otra."
>
> ---Gracián, *El Criticón* (Crisi séptima)

The *comedias* studied in this dissertation display prominent monstrous characters. Noticeably, they all come from the earlier years of Lope's theatrical production, between c.1588-1617. During this period, Spain has already begun its economic and political decline. Questions of social identity remained important, as the noble classes of Spaniards struggled against increasingly mobile middle classes for exclusive access to privilege. Felipe III is crowned in 1598, and his rule is dominated by his favorites, especially the Duque de Lerma, raising questions as to what makes the ideal monarch, and should be able to ascend to political power. The last of the mosricos are expelled in 1605, but many returned and stayed for the rest of their lives, demonstrating Spain's continued battle with Islam into the seventeenth century.[109] As exploration and colonization of the New World continues, so does the debate over the methods

[109] T. Dadson writes that the morisco figure of Ricote in the Quijote, who returns to Spain and appears fully assimilated into Castillian culture, is not an exception to the rule that all moriscos were expelled, but rather an extremely common occurance. He explains there was a "gran número de moriscos antiguos que consiguieron volver a su patria, algunos de ellos más de una vez, y, una vez vueltos, quedarse allí para siempre. La figura de Ricote no es una figura sola, aislada o anormal; Cervantes supo recrear en él casi todas las características de los moriscos de la Mancha que él conocía tan bien. Y este deseo suyo y de los suyos por volver a España, como fuera, era rasgo común de casi todos los moriscos de La Mancha y del Campo de Calatrava" (23).

of conquest and treatment of the newest Spaniards, as well as Spain's identity as supreme purveyor of Christianity. As mentioned in Chapter III, the first years of the seventeenth century in particular saw a surge in cultural production based on Spanish historiography that sought to create an image of Spain as a legitimate, powerful, and preeminent state among other European ones. It is not a coincidence that Lope's most developed monster characters appear in plays from this time period, because Spain itself was in the midst of defining itself versus its own social, political, and religious "monsters."

The monsters of Lope's *comedias* are his dramatic interpretation of a variety of contemporary concerns. The woman accused of adultery is a monster because she threatens the honor of her husband and family. Ostracized by society, she loses her identity and is perceived as a social outsider, more animal than human. The envious and lustful noble is a monster because he or she resorts to sin and deception in order to ascend socially. The tyrant king is a monster because he ascends to the throne illegitimately, displays excessive vice–especially greed, envy and wrath–and destroys the state instead of protecting it. Spanish explorers are monsters because, driven by greed for gold and lust for women, they disobey the holy mission of conversion in order to fulfill their own depraved human desires. The *batuecos*, ancient Spaniards, are monsters because they have lost their Christian identity as a result of King Rodrigo's sins. Religious, political, and social outsiders, they live without God, King, or laws. Civilized Spaniards are depicted as monsters when they trade their civilized, Christian identity for one of barbarianism and lawlessness to consummate an illicit love affair. Together, they illustrate sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Spain's social, political, and religious monsters, breakers of conventional norms that interrogated the integrity of the very image that Spain sought to fashion.

If we interpret the signs of these monsters, we can see their function is twofold. On the one hand, the monster embodies the characteristics that Lope saw as undesirable for Spanish identity. In renaissance self-fashioning the monster embodies that which the Self is not or desires not to be. Lope saw the ideal Spanish identity as the opposite of moral depravity and social, political, and religious disorder. In other words, Spanish identity should include a virtuous and justly ordered society; a well-educated and moral monarchy that protects the people, the state, and its broader political welfare; obedience to the mandates and interests of the Catholic Church; and an exalted, righteous, and legitimate place in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Europe.

On the other hand, Lope uses moral monsters to contradict the notion of Spanish Self versus the Monstrous Other by showing that monstrosity lies in the universal enemy: sin. The common thread that unites each of the monsters studied here is their immorality. These moral monsters display, above all else, four of the Seven Deadly Sins: lust, greed, wrath, and envy.[110] For Lope, if the soul is monstrous, then one becomes a monster; if the soul is pure, then one remains human. We see this idea reflected in the philosophical words of two great slayers of monsters, Don Quijote and Sancho:

> –Advierte, Sancho –respondió don Quijote–, que hay dos maneras de hermosura: una del alma y otra del cuerpo; la del alma campea y se muestra en el entendimiento, en la honestidad, en el buen proceder, en la liberalidad y en la buena crianza, y todas estas partes caben y pueden estar en un hombre feo; y cuando se pone la mira en esta hermosura, y no en la del cuerpo, suele nacer el amor con ímpetu y con ventajas. Yo, Sancho, bien veo que no soy hermoso, pero también conozco que no soy disforme; y bástale a un hombre de bien no ser monstruo para ser bien querido, como tenga los dotes del alma que te he dicho. (II, Chapter 58, 510-511).

The hidalgo de La Mancha says, in other words, that one can be monstrously ugly in appearance, but possess a pure and beautiful soul. Therefore, one must look inside in order to determine

[110] Kallendorf argues that both the Ten Commandments and the Seven Deadly Sins formed part of the moral system of early modern Spain (203). She does not, however, discount the intelligence and agency of early modern playwrights to choose one over the other (204).

whether a person is monstrous or lovely. The spiritual gifts of a pure soul can overcome external deformity. As long as a man has virtue, he will not become a monster. Lope's representation of monstrosity and identity echoes this sentiment.

Thus, Lope does not see the monster as radically Other, but as a universal, potential expression of the human Self. It is sin that drives the monstrous characters' actions in the plays and causes social, political, and religious disorder. The characters' actions threaten social reputation and hierarchical social order; the integrity of monarchical rule and the conservation of the state; Spain's religious purity and unity; and its image as a legitimate and powerful nation. At the end of the plays, the monsters' threatening disorder is remedied by bringing the monster under control, either through death, exile, or transformation, allowing for happy and harmonious endings. However, the basic sinfulness of Lope's monsters conveys an unsettling truth about them: they can never really be completely controlled. Cohen writes that "the monster's body is both corporeal and incorporeal; its threat is its propensity to shift" ("Monster Theory" 5). Unlike the physical monster whose deformity can be hidden, locked away, or destroyed, the moral monster has the ability to shift, to change bodies, to reappear even after it has been overpowered. It even has the power to hide under the appearance of virtue and convention. The moral monster thus causes a collective anxiety because in its ability to survive attempts to restrain it, it poses a constant threat to order.

Lope's moral monsters are hybrid beings that allow Lope to convey a mixture of dominant and subversive ideologies. They are, at once, innocent and guilty, apparently virtuous but deceptively sinful, civilized and uncivilized, the protector of the state and also the destroyer of it, exalted members of Spain's past and damagers of its legacy. Though all of Lope's monsters in these plays display sin, none of them fit neatly into defined categories of vice versus virtue,

good versus evil, "us" versus "them." Rather, they exist as a kind of third term that interrogates binary thinking and creates a crisis of categorization. As the bringers of category crisis, Lope's monsters show us that his plays are not monolithic in ideology. Sometimes, the monsters embody the dominant version of the Other, such as when they are evil, barbaric, and animal-like. However, when these monsters simultaneously display, or appear to display, characteristics of virtue, civilization, and humanity, Lope shows he is also capable of questioning the dominant ideas of who Spaniards are and who they are not.

In its hybridity and marginality, the moral monster at once repulses and attracts. As the embodiment of *that which we are not*, the monsters would have caused repulsion and anxiety in the audience. However, they also would have been engrossed by them. E. del Río Parra writes, "la atracción por lo excéntrico y lo deforme es una vía de escape tanto para evitar la realidad, como para nombrarla…Para eludir una realidad que no satisface se crea el asombro por medio de lo monstruoso mientras que, al mismo tiempo, para aludir a una realidad que no gusta, el mejor método es recurrir a lo deforme" (*Una era de monstruos* 16). In its abnormality, eccentricity, and deformity, the monster provides fascinating and escapist entertainment by incarnating on stage all that was forbidden by the institutions that ordered society. The monster is also, as Río Parra says, a way to name the reality in which Lope lives. The monster provides a way for Lope to show the complexity of his time, in which the members of his audience lived between a sense of collective Spanishness that spoke to the dominant order, and an individual reality that included a variety of expressions of that Spanishness and the constant human struggle between good and evil.

Lope's monsters are one of the ways he seeks to understand and dramatically represent his reality. R. Miñana's analysis of the role of the monster in this time period adeptly summarizes its broader function:

> el monstruo que fascina a escritores barrocos como Gracián, Lope de Vega y Calderón no es solamente un ser perverso, deforme y feo; es un signo que expone las incertidumbres del mundo, la relatividad moral que el hombre enfrenta a cada paso. El monstruo, con su carácter extremo y fuera de lo ordinario, despierta al hombre a la verdad de la interpretación. Para alcanzar el conocimiento, debemos interpretar signos; necesitamos leer las señales de la realidad si aspiramos a comprender la hibridez y complejidad del mundo. (14)

In other words, Lope and other writers and playwrights of his time create monsters to represent the subjective morality of their world. Through the inherent hybridism and disorder of the monster, they can appropriate it to display the complexity of their realities. This study of Lope's monsters shows that Lope employs the monster in this fashion. Through his monstrous characters, Lope shows that Spanish identity in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was not established or uniform. Lope's monsters are not the antithesis of a dominant identity, but rather the crisis of that identity. He uses them to both acknowledge and interrogate the notion of honor as social reputation, the character of the ideal king, the methods of the conquest, and the preeminence of Spain's Visigoth past, which formed the very foundation of the image of Spain as a unified nation, under one society, that was ordered by blood purity, one God, one Church, one monarchy, one illustrious history, and sought to expand its empire and increase its political influence. The monsters are the dramatic representation of the plurality of experiences of living in Spain in the early modern period, and of the complexity and subjectivity of Spanish societal order and identity. Lope's primary purpose is no doubt to entertain, and his category-breaking monsters would certainly have intrigued his audience in their costume, speech and behavior. However, with these characters he also subtly asks his audience to look deeply into the signs of

the monsters, because there they will recognize the complex existence they, too, are living, and witness the same inherent struggle between good and evil that all humans face.

In our modern times, when religious differences cause wars, dissimilar political views sharply divide communities, and people who challenge gender norms experience persecution, the language of monstrosity remains omnipresent in news stories, radio shows, and everyday conversations. Early modern Spain's representation of monsters continues to speak to concerns about how we deal with religious, political, gender, and cultural differences in the twenty-first century. Lope reminds us to look deeply into the meaning of the language and imagery we use to portray difference in today's society, and consider that the monster is not always who we might expect. Monsters are all around us; they are also, he says, within all of us.

WORKS CITED

Anónimo. "Mira Nero de Tarpeya." *Romancero General*. BAE 10. Madrid: Atlas, 1945. No. 571. 393-394.

Albrecht, Jane. *The Playgoing Public of Madrid in the Time of Tirso de Molina.* New Orleans: UP of the South, 2001.

Alfaro, Arsenio. "Observaciones sobre el rey y el sentimiento monárquico en la comedia española de la edad de oro." *Revista Hispánica Moderna* 34 (1968): 132-139.

Alighieri, Dante. *The Inferno*. Trans. John Ciardi. New York: New American Library, 1954.

Álvarez Junco, José. "Identidad heredada y construcción nacional. Algunas propuestas sobre el caso español, del Antiguo Régimen a la Revolución liberal." *Historia y política: ideas procesos y movimientos sociales* 2 (1999): 123-148.

Ancell, Matthew. "Este…Cíclope: Góngora's Polifemo and the Poetics of Disfiguration." *Hispanic Review* 79.4 (2011): 547-572.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso, 2006.

Antonucci, Fausta. *El salvaje en la comedia del Siglo de Oro. Historia de un tema de Lope a Calderón*. Pamplona: Universidad de Navarra, 1995.

Arco y Garay, Ricardo del. *La sociedad española en las obras dramáticas de Lope de Vega*. Madrid: Real Academia Española, 1942.

Arellano, Ignacio. *Convención y recepción: Estudios sobre el teatro del Siglo de Oro*. Madrid: Editorial Gredos, 1999.

---. *Historia del teatro español del siglo XVII*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1995.

Aristotle. *De anima*. Ed. Ronald Polansky. New York: Cambdrige UP, 2007.

Ariza, Mercedes. "Naufragios comunicativos en *El Nuevo Mundo descubierto por Cristóbal Colón*: Una aproximación didáctica a la mediación intercultural." *Entreculturas* 2 (2010): 35-47.

Artigas, María del Carmen. "El lenguaje poético como crítica social en la *Roma abrasada* de Lope de Vega." *Explicación de textos literarios* 30.1-2 (2001-2002): 47-58.

Augustine, Saint. "On the Trinity." *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church. Vol. III: St. Augustin on the Holy Trinity, Doctrinal Treatises,*

Moral Treatises. Ed. Philip Schaff, LL.D. Buffalo: The Christian Literature Co., 1887. 2-228.

Ávila, Juan de. Luis Sala Balust & Francisco Martín Hernández, eds. *Obras completas del santo maestro Juan de Ávila*. Vol. VI. Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1971.

Aznar Gil, Federico R. *La institución matrimonial en la Hispania cristiana bajomedieval (1215-1563)*. Salamanca: Publicaciones Universidad Pontificia Salamanca, 1989.

Baltrusaitis, Jurgis. *La edad media fantástica*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1983.

Bartra, Robert. "Las mujeres salvajes del Siglo de Oro, bellos monstrous de la naturaleza." *El salvaje artificial.* México, D.F.: Ediciones Era, 1997. 106-128.

---. *El salvaje en el espejo*. Méjico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Ediciones Era, 1992.

Bavía, Luis de. *Historia pontifical y católica*. 5 vols. Madrid, 1652.

Bernheimer, R. *Wild Men in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1952.

Bershas, H.N. "Lope de Vega and the Post of Royal Chronicler." *Hispanic Review* 31 (1963): 109-117.

Biblioteca Nacional de España. *Monstruos y seres imaginarios en la Biblioteca Nacional.* Madrid: Algete, 2000.

Bildhauer, Bettina and Mills, Robert. *The Monstrous Middle Ages*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2003.

Binsfeld, Peter. *Tractatus de confessionaibus maleficorum et sagarum*. Woodbridge: Research Publications, 1969.

Blüher, Karl Alfred. "Lope de Vega y Séneca: A propósito de la tragedia *Roma abrasada*." *Studia in honorem Prof. M. Riquer.* Barcelona: Quaderns Crema, 1986. 237-255.

Bravo-Villasante, Carmen. *La mujer vestida de hombre en el teatro español (siglos XVI-XVII).* Madrid: Revista de Occidente, 1955.

Brody, Ervin C. *The Demetrius Legend and Its Literary Treatment in the Age of the Baroque.* Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickenson UP, 1972.

Brown, Peter. *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation*. New York: Columbia UP, 2008.

Calderón de la Barca, Pedro. *El alcalde de Zalamea*. Ed. José María Díez Borque. Madrid: Castalia, 1976,

---. *El mayor monstruo los celos*. Ed. Everett W. Hesse. Madison: U of Wisconsin P. 1955.

Callahan, William J. *Honor, Commerce and Industry in Eighteenth-Century Spain*. Boston: Harvard School of Business Administration, 1972.

Campo Guinea, María del Juncal. "Evolución del matrimonio en Navarra en los siglos XVI y XVII. El matrimonio clandestino." Eds. Ignacio Arellano & Jesús María Usunáriz. *El matrimonio en Europa y el mundo hispánico*. *Siglos XVI y XVII.* Madrid: Visor Libros, 2005. 197-209.

The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent. Trans. Thedore Alois Buckley. London: George Routledge and Co., 1851.

Carey-Webb, Allen. "Other-Fashioning: The Discourse of Empire and Nation in Lope de Vega's *El Nuevo Mundo descubierto por Cristóbal Colón*." *Making Subject(s): Literature and the Emergence of National Identity*. New York: Garland, 1998. 33-55.

Caro Baroja, Julio. "El 'Pesce Cola' o el 'Peje Nicolao,'" *Revista de Dialectología y Tradiciones Populares* 39 (1984): 7-16.

Carranza, Claudia. "Monstruos y prodigios en la literatura de cordel del siglo XVII español." *Revista de Literaturas Populares* 7.1 (2001): 5-35.

Carrasco Manchado, Ana Isabel. *Isabel I de Castilla y la sombra de la ilegitimidad: propaganda y representación en el conflicto sucesorio* (1474-1482). Madrid: Sílex, 2006.

Case, Thomas E. "El indio y el moro en las comedias de Lope de Vega." *Looking at the omedia in the Year of the Quincentential.* Eds. Barbara Mujica and Sharon D. Voros. Lanham: UP of America, 1992. 13-21.

---. "Some Observations on the Reference to the Goths in the Dramas of Lope de Vega." *Revista de Estudios Hispánicos* III (1969): 67-89.

Castañeda, Luis Hernán. " 'So color de religión': resolución dramática, disidencia ideológica y crisis de legitimación imperial en *El Nuevo Mundo descubierto por Cristóbal Colón* de Lope de Vega." *Gestos* 25.49 (2010): 35-41.

Castells, Ricardo. "Oro e idolatría en *El Nuevo Mundo descubierto por Cristóbal Colón* de Lope de Vega." *Neophilologus* 84.3 (2000): 385-397.

Castillo, Moisés R. "Lope de Vega, inventor de América*: El Nuevo Mundo descubierto por Cristóbal Colón*." *Bulletin of the Comediantes* 54.1 (2002): 57-90.

Castro, Américo. “Algunas observaciones acerca del concepto de honor en los siglos XVI y XVII.” *Revista de Filología Española* 2 (1916): 34.

---. *De la edad conflictiva.* Madrid: Taurus, 1961.

---. *La realidad histórica de España.* México: Editorial Porrúa, 1982.

Catalán, Diego. “España en su historiografía: de objeto a sujeto de la historia.” *Los españoles en la historia*. Ramón Menéndez Pidal. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1982. 9-67.

Cervantes, Miguel de. *Obras completas*. 2 vols. Ed. Florencio Sevilla Arroyo. Madrid: Castalia, 1999.

Chamandijan, Lucia. “La visión matizada del Nuevo Mundo en *El Nuevo Mundo descubierto por Cristóbal Colón*, de Lope de Vega.” *Anuario Lope de Vega* 4 (1998): 97-105.

Checa, Jorge. “Figuraciones de lo monstruoso: Quevedo y Gracián.” *Revista de Investigación Quevediana* 2 (1998): 195-211.

Cirlot, Juan E. *Diccionario de símbolos.* Barcelona: Ediciones Labor S. A., 1969.

Cohen, Jeffrey Jerome. “Monster Culture (Seven Theses).” *Monster Theory: Reading Culture*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1996. 3-25.

---. “The Order of Monsters: Monsters Lore and Medieval Narrative Tradition.” Eds. Francesca Canade Sautman, et. al. *Telling Tales: Medieval Narratives and the Folk Tradition.* New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1998. 37-58.

Colburn, Guy Blandin. “Greek and Roman Themes in the Spanish Drama.” *Hispania* 22.2 (1939): 153-158.

Colón, Cristóbal. *Diario de a bordo,* Ed. J.Arce y J.Gil Esteve. Turín: Alpignano, 1971.

Corominas, Joan. *Breve diccionario etimológico de la lengua castellana*. Madrid: Gredos, 1987.

---. *Diccionario crítico etimológico castellano e hispánico*. Vol. IV. Madrid: Gredos, 1985.

Corral, Pedro de. *Crónica del rey don Rodrigo (Crónica sarracina)*. Ed. James Donald Fogelquist. Madrid: Castalia, 2001.

Cotarelo y Mori, Emilio. “El animal de Hungría.” *Obras de Lope de Vega.* Vol. III. Madrid: Real Academia Española, 1917. 425.

Covarrubias, Sebastián de. *Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española.* Eds. Ignacio Arellano y Rafael Zafra. Madrid: Iberoamericana, 2006.

Dadson, Trevor. *Los moriscos de Villarrubia de los Ojos (siglos XV-XVIII): Historia de una minoría asimilada, expulsada y reintegrada*. Madrid: Iberoamericana, 2007.

D'Agostino, María. "Dos pliegos de 1608: 'El pez Nicolás'" *Filologia dei testi a stampa (area iberica), a cura di P. Botta*. Modena: Mucchi Ediotore, 2005. 467-475.

Damiani, Bruno. "The Didactic Intention of the *Cárcel de amor*." *Hispanófila* 76 (1976): 29-43.

Dangler, Jean. *Making Difference in Medieval and Early Modern Iberia*. Notre Dame, Indiana: U of Notre Dame P, 2005.

Deyermond, Alan D. "El hombre salvaje en la novela sentimental." *Filología* 10 (1964): 97-111.

Díez Borque, José María. *Sociología de la comedia española del siglo XVII*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1976.

Dominquez-Ortíz, Antonio. *La clase social de los conversos en Castilla en la Edad Moderna*. Granada: C.S.I.C., 1991.

---. *La sociedad española en el siglo XVII.* Granada: C.S.I.C., 1992.

Dopico Black, Georgina. *Perfect Wives, Other Women: Adultery and Inquisition in Early Modern Spain*. Durham: Duke UP, 2001.

Drew, Katherine Fischer, ed. *The Laws of the Salian Franks*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1991.

Dudley, Edward, and Maximilian.E Novak, eds. *The Wild Man Within: An Image in Western Thought from Renaissance to Romanticism*. London: U of Pittsburg P, 1972.

Dunn, Peter N. "Honour and the Christian Background in Calderón." *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 37:2 (1960): 75-105.

Echeverría, Roberto González. "Calderón's La vida es sueño. Mixed-(Up) Monsters." *Celestina's Brood: Continuities of the Baroque in Spanish and Latin American Literatures*. Durham: Duke UP, 1993. 81-113.

Egido, Aurora. "El vestido del salvaje en los autos sacramentales de Calderón." *El gran teatro de Calderón: Personajes, temas, escenografía*. Kassel: Edition Reichenberger, 1995. 37-61.

---. "La universidad de amor y *La dama boba.*" *Boletín de la Biblioteca Menéndez Pelayo* 54 (1978): 351- 370.

Elliott, John Huxtable. "Concerto Barroco." *The New York Review of Books* 9 (1987): 26-9.

---. *The Count-Duke of Olivares. The Statesman in an Age of Decline.* New Haven: Yale UP, 1986.

---. *Empires of the Atlantic World: Britain and Spain in America 1492-1830*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2006.

---. *Imperial Spain 1469-1716*. London: Penguin, 2002.

---. *Spain and its World 1500-1700*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1989.

Engels, Friedrich. *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*. Hammondsworth: Penguin, 1985.

Entrambasaguas, Joaquín de. *Estudios sobre Lope de Vega*. Madrid: CSIC, 1967.

Ettinghausen, Henry, ed. *Noticias del siglo XVII, relaciones españolas de sucesos naturales y sobrenaturales.* Barcelona: Pulvill Libros, 1995.

Exum, Frances. *The Metamorphosis of Lope de Vega's King Pedro*. Madrid: Colección Plaza Mayor Scholar, 1974.

Ferber, Michael. *A Dictionary of Literary Symbols*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999.

Fernández Albaladejo, Pablo. *Fragmentos de monarquía: trabajos de historia política*. Madrid: Alianza, 1992.

Fernández de Otero, Jerónimo. *El maestro del príncipe*. Madrid: la viuda de Iuan González, 1633.

Fernández-Santamaría, José A. *Razón de estado y política en el pensamiento español del barroco (1595-1640)*. Madrid: Centro de estudios constitucionales, 1986.

Finucci, Valeria. *The Manly Masquerade: Masculinity, Paternity, and Castration in the Italian Renaissance.* Durham: Duke UP, 2003.

Forcione, Alban K. *Cervantes' Christian Romance: A Study of Persiles y Sigismunda*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1972.

Foucault, Michel. *Los anormales*. *Texto del informe del curso de 1974-1975 dictado por Michel Foucault in el College de France*. Trans. Horacio Pons. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultural Económica. Buenos Aires, 2007.

Friedman, John Block. *The Monstrous Races in Medieval Art and Thought*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1981.

Fuchs, Barbara. *Mimesis and Empire: The New World, Islam, and European Identities*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001.

Fuentelapeña, Fray A. de. *El ente dilucidado: Discurso único, novísimo que muestra hay en la naturaleza animales irraciocionales invisibles, y cuáles sean.* Ed. J. Ruiz. Madrid: Editora Nacional, Biblioteca de visionarios, heterodoxos y marginados, 1978.

García Arranz, Julio. "Monstruos y mitos clásicos en las primeras crónicas e imágenes europeas de América: los acéfalos." *Humanismo y pervivencia del mundo clásico II.1 Homenaje al profesor Luis Gil.* Eds. José María Maestre, Luis Charlo Brea, Joaquín Pascual Barea. Alcañiz: Instituto de Estudios Humanísticos, 1997. 337-347.

---. "Las relaciones de monstruos en el contexto de la teratología ilustrada de la Edad Moderna." *La fiesta. Actas del II Seminario de Relaciones de Sucesos.* La Coruña: Sociedad de Cultura Valle Inclán, 1999. 133-144.

Geremek, Bronislaw. "The Marginal Man." *Medieval Callings*. Ed. Jacques Le Goff. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1990. 347-373.

Gigas, Émile. "El Gran Duque de Moscovia y emperador perseguido." *Revue hispanique* 81.2 (1933): 177-189.

Gómez-Mariana, Antonio. *Derecho de Resistencia y tiranicidio: Estudio de una temática en las "comedias" de Lope de Vega*. Santiago de Compostela: Porto y Cía, 1968.

González Fernández, Luis. "'Como le pintan': La figura del demonio en *Las Batuecas del Duque de Alba*, de Lope de Vega." *Anuario Lope de Vega* 4 (1998): 115-126.

González-Ruiz, Julio. *Amistades peligrosas: el discurso homoerótico en el teatro de Lope de Vega*. New York: Peter Lang, 2009.

---. "Poética y monstruosidad: homoerotismo en *La prueba de los ingeios*, de Lope de Vega." *Revista Canandiense de Estudios Hispánicos* 29.1 (2010): 143-155.

Gracián, Baltasar. *El criticón* (1651, 1653, 1657). Ed. Antonio Prieto. Barcelona: Planeta, 1985.

---. *El político don Fernando el Católico*. Zaragoza: Institución Fernando el Católico (C.I.S.C.), 1985.

Greenblatt. Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare.* Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1980.

Greer, Margaret. "Imperialism and Anthropophagy in Early Modern Spanish Tragedy: The Unthought Known." *Reason and Its Others in Early Modern Spain and Italy*. Nashville: Vanderbilt UP, 2006. 279-295.

Guevara, Fray Antonio de. *Menosprecio de corte y alabanza de aldea*. Ed. Pablo Pou y Fernandez. Zaragoza: Editorial Ebro, 1969.

Gurrea, Diego. *Arte de enseñar hijos de príncipes y señores*. Lérida: M. Anglada y P. Cana's, 1627.

Hamilton, Edith. *Mythology*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1998.

Herrero García, Miguel. "La monarquía teorética de Lope de Vega." *Fén* I (1935): 179-224, 303-62.

Holloway, James E., Jr. "Lope's Neoplatonism: *La Dama Boba*." *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 49.3 (1972): 236-255.

Huet, Marie-Hélène. *Monstrous Imagination*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1993.

Husband, Timothy. *The Wild Man: Medieval Myth and Legend*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1980.

Hsu, Carmen. "Los chinos de Manila a través de las relaciones de sucesos del siglo XVII." *Representaciones de la alteridad, ideológica, religiosa, humana y espacial en las relaciones de sucesos (siglos XVI-XVIII)*. Besançon: Presses universitaires de Franche-Comté, 2009. 303-315.

Ilie, Paul. "Gracián and the Moral Grotesque." *Hispanic Review* 39 (1971): 30-48.

Jones, C.A. "Honor in El alcalde de Zalamea." *Critical Essays on the Theatre of Calderón*. New York: New York UP, 1965. 193-202.

---. "Honor in Spanish Golden-Age Drama: Its Relation to Real Life and to Morals." *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 35 (1958): 199-210.

---. "Spanish Honour as Historical Phenomenon, Convention and Artistic Motive." *Hispanic Review* 33 (1965): 32-39.

Kallendorf, Hilaire. *Sins of the Fathres: Moral Economies in Early Modern Spain.* Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2013.

Kantorowicz, Ernst Hartwig. *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology.* Princeton: Princeton UP, 1957.

Kappler, Claude. *Monstres, demons et merveilles à la fin du moyen âge*. Paris: Payot, 1980.

Kelley, Erna Berndt. "Popularidad del romance 'Mira Nero de Tarpeya.'" *Estudios dedicados a James Homer Harriot*. Madison: U of Wisconsin, 1966. 117-126.

Kidd, Michael. "The Performance of Desire: Acting and Being in Lope de Vega's *El laberinto de Creta*." *Bulletin of Comediantes* 47.1 (1995): 21-36.

Kirschner, Teresa J. "Exposición y subversion del discurso hegemonónico en pro de la conquista en *El Nuevo Mundo* de Lope de Vega." *El escritor y la escena*. Ed. Ysla Campbell. Ciudad Juárez: U Autónoma de Ciudad Juárez P, 1993. 45-48.

---. "The Staging of the Conquest in a play by Lope de Vega." *Pacific Coast Philology* 27 1/2 (1992): 37- 43.

Kluge, Sofie. "A Hermaphrodite? Lope de Vega and the Controversy of Tragicomedy." *Comparative Drama* 41.3 (2007): 297-333.

Koenigsberger, Helmut G. "Spain." *National Consciousness, History, and Political Culture in Early Modern Europe.* Ed. Orest Ranum. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1975. 144-172.

Kamen, Henry. *Spain 1469-1714: A society of conflict*. 2nd Ed. London: Longman, 1991.

Knoppers, Laura Lunger, and Joan B. Landes, eds. *Monstrous Bodies/ Political Monstrosities In Early Modern Europe*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2004.

Kristeva, Julia. *The Power of Horror. An Essay on Abjection.* Trans. Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia UP, 1982.

Lafuente, Antonio y Valverde, Nuria. "¿Qué se puede hacer con los monstruos?" *Monstruos y seres imaginarios en la Biblioteca Nacional.* Madrid: Algete, 2000. 15-38.

Lagresa, Elizabeth. "Monstruos de la naturaleza. Violencia y feminidad en *La varona castellana* de Lope de Vega." *eHumanist*a 17 (2011): 99-133.

Lauer, A. Robert. "The Iberian Encounter of America in the Spanish Theater of the Golden Age." *Pacific Coast Philology* 28.1 (1993): 32-42.
---. *Tyrannicide and drama*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner-Verlag Wiesbaden GMBH, 1987.

Lawson, Richard H. "El Gran Duque de Moscovia . . . A Likely Source for Lessing." *Romance Notes* 4 (1952): 58-62.

Leclercq-Marx, Jacqueline. "Los monstruos antropomorfos de origen antiguo en la Edad Media. Persistencia, mutaciones y recreaciones." *Anales de Historia del Arte* Volumen Extraordinario (2010): 259-274.

Le Goff, Jacques. *The Medieval Imagination*. Trans. Arthur Goldhammer. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1988.

León, Fray Luis de. *La perfecta casada*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1980.

López Bravo, Mateo. *De rege et regendi ratione*. Matriti: Apud viduam L. Sanctii, 1627.

López Gutierrez, Luciano. *Portentos y prodigios del Siglo de Oro*. Madrid: Ediciones Nowtilus, S.L, 2012.

López Ríos, Santiago. "El hombre salvaje en entre la edad media y el renacimiento: Leyenda oral, iconográfica y literaria." *Cuadernos del CEMYR* 14 (2006): 233-250.

---. *Salvajes y razas monstruosas en la literatura castellana medieval.* Madrid: Fundación Universitaria Española, 1999.

Lynch, John. *Spain Under the Hapsburgs*. 2 vols. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1969.

Madrigal, José Antonio. "La función del hombre salvaje en el teatro de Lope de Vega, Tirso de Molina y Calderón de la Barca." Diss U of Kentucky, 1973.

Maravall, José Antonio. *La cultura del barroco: análisis de una estructura histórica*. Barcelona: Ariel, 1975.

---. "Una interpretación histórico-social del teatro barroco." *Cuadernos Hispanoamericanos* 234 (1969): 74-108.

---. *Teatro y literatura en la sociedad barroca*. *Edición corregida y aumentada*. Barcelona: Crítica, 1990.

---. *La teoría española del estado en el siglo XVII.* Madrid: Instituto de estudios políticos, 1944.

Mariana, Juan de. *De Rege et Regis Institutione*. Toledo: Pedro Rodriguez, 1599.

Martín, Adrienne L. "Learning Through Love in Lope de Vega's Drama." *Women's Literacy in Early Modern Spain and the New World*. Eds. Anne J. Cruz and Rosilie Hernández. Burlington: Ashgate, 2011. 177-190.

Martinengo, Alessandro. "Las cronistas de Indias y la construcción teatral de *El Nuevo Mundo descubierto por Cristóbal Colón* de Lope de Vega." *Teatro* 15 (2001): 5-20.

Máritr Rizo, Juan Pablo. *Norte de príncipes y Vida de Rómulo*. Ed. J.A. Maravall, Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Políticos, 1945.

Mazur, Oleh. "Various Folkloric Impacts upon the *Salvaje* in the Spanish *Comedia*." *Hispanic Review* 36 (1968): 207-35.

---. *The Wild Man in the Spanish Renaissance and Golden Age Theater: A Comparative Study including the Indio, the Bárbaro and Their Counterparts in European Lores.* Dissertation, U of Pennsylvania, 1996. Ann Arbor, MI: ProQuest/UMI, 1966.

McKendrick, Melveena. *Identities in Crisis: Essays on Honour, Gender and Women in the Comedia*. Kassel: Edition Reichenberger, 2002.

---. *Playing the King. Lope de Vega and the Limits of Conformity*. London: Tamesis, 2000.

Mendo, P. Andrés. *Príncipe perfeto y ministros ajustados*. Leon de Francia: H. Boissat y G. Remevs, 1662.

Menéndez y Pelayo, Marcelino. "Las batuecas del duque de Alba." *Estudios sobre el teatro de Lope de Vega.* Vol. VI. Santander: Aldus, 1949. 364-387.

---. *Estudios sobre el teatro de Lope de Vega*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1949.

Menéndez Pidal, Ramón. *Historia de España*. Vol. 24. Madrid: Espasa Calpa, 1979.

---."Del honor en el teatro español." *Cervantes y Lope de Vega*. Buenos Aires: Espasa-Calpe, 1940. 145-173.

Mexía, Pedro. *Historia imperial y cesárea*. Madrid: Melchor Sánchez, 1655.

McKendrick, Melveena. *Playing the King: Lope de Vega and the Limits of Conformity*. Rochester: Tamesis, 2000.

---. *Woman and Society in the Spanish Drama of the Golden Age: A Study of the 'Mujer Varonil.'* London: Cambdrige UP, 1974.

Miñana, Rogelio. *Monstruos que hablan: El discurso de la monstruosidad en Cervantes*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2007.

Minian de Alfie, Raquel. "Lope, lector de cronistas de Indias." *Filología* 11 (1965): 1-21.

Mittman, Asa Simon. "Introduction: The Impact of Monsters and Monster Studies." *The Ashgate Research Companion to Monsters and the Monstrous*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2012. 1-14.

Morby, Edwin S. "Some Observations on tragedia and tragicomedia in Lope." *Hispanic Review* 11.3 (1943): 185-209.

Morel D´Aleux, Antonia. "Las relaciones de hermafroditas: dos ejemplos diferentes de una misma manipulación ideológica." *Las relaciones de sucesos en España (1500- 1750)*: *actas del primer coloquio internacional.* Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá de Henares, 1996. 261-274.

Morley, S. Griswold and Courtney Bruerton. *Cronología de las comedias de Lope de Vega.* Madrid: Gredos, 1968.

Mosquera, Juan. *Relación de la señalada y como milagrosa conquista del paterno imperio conseguida del serenísimo Príncipe Juan Demetrio, Gran Duque de Moscovia, en el año 1605.* Valladolid: Andrés de Merchan, 1606.

Nelson, Bradley. *The Persistance of Presence: Emblem and Ritual in Baroque Spain.* Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2010.

Novísima recopilación de las leyes de España. Tomo V. Madrid: S.N., 1805.

Ocampo, Florian de. *Los quatro libros primeros de la crónica general de España*. Zamora: Juan Picardo, 1543.

Oleza, Joan. "Del primer Lope al 'Arte nuevo': estudio preliminar." *Peribáñez y el comendador de Ocaña.* Ed. Donald McGrady. Barcelona: Crítica. 1997. 9-55.

Olivares Martínez, Diana. "El salvaje en la Baja Edad Media," *Revista Digital de Iconografía Medieval* 5 (2013).

Oxford Latin Dictionary. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2012.

Oviedo y Valdés, Gonzalo Francisco de. *Historia general y natural de las Indias, islas y tierra-firme del mar Océano*. Ed. José Amador de los Ríos. 14 vols. Asunción: Editorial Guaranía, 1944-1945.

Ozment, Steven. *When Fathers Ruled: Family Life in Reformation Europe*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1983.

Paré, Ambroise. *Des monstres et prodiges.* Ed. Jean Céard, Geneve: Librairie Droz, 1971.

Park, Katherine, y Daston, Lorraine. "Unnatural Conceptions: The Study of Monsters in Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century France and England." *Past and Present* 92 (1981): 20-54.

---. *Wonders and the Order of Nature, 1150-1750*. New York: Zone Books, 1998.

Pfandl, Ludwig. *Geschichte der spanischen Nationalliteratur in ihrer Bluetezeit*. Freiburg im Bresgau, 1929.

Poehl, Gertrude von. "La fuente de *El Gran Duque de Moscovia* de Lope de Vega." *Revista de Filología Española* 19 (1932): 47-63.

Praag, J.A. van. "Más noticias sobre la fuente de *El Gran Duque de Moscovia* de Lope de Vega." *Bulletine Hispanique* 39 (1937): 73-85.

Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London: Routledge, 1992.

Quevedo, Francisco de. *Política de Dios y gobierno de Cristo*. Ed. James O. Crosby. Madrid: Castalia, 1966.

Real Academia Española. *Diccionario de autoridades*. Madrid: Editorial Gredos, 1964.

Redondo, Agustín "Los prodigios en las relaciones de sucesos de los siglos XVI y XVII." *Las relaciones de sucesos en España (1500-1750)*: *actas del primer coloquio internacional.* Alcalá de Henares**:** Universidad de Alcalá de Henares, 1996. 287-304.

---. "Las relaciones de sucesos en prosa (siglos XVI y XVII)." *Anthropos* 166-167 (1995): 51-59.

Reichenberger, Arnold G. "The Uniqueness of the Comedia." *Hispanic Review* 27 (1959): 303-316.

Río Parra, Elena del. "Entre historia y relato: Los orígenes de *El animal de Hungría* de Lope de Vega." *Hispanófila* 139 (2003): 49-60.

---. *Una era de monstrous: Representaciones de lo deforme en el Siglo de Oro español.* Madrid: Iberoamericana-Vervuet, 2003.

Rivadeneyra, Pedro de. *Tratado del príncipe cristiano. Obras escogidas del padre Pedro de Rivadeneyra.* Madrid: Impr. de los Sucesores de Hernando, 1919. 419-587.

Rivilla Bonet y Pueyo, José. *Desvíos de la naturaleza o tratado del origen de los monstruos.* Lima: José de Contreras y Alvarado, 1695.

Rodríguez, Leandro. "La función del monarca en Lope de Vega." *Lope de Vega y los orígenes del teatro español: Actas del primer congreso internacional sobre Lope de Vega*. Madrid: Edi-6, 1981. 799-804.

Rodríguez Baltanás. Enrique Jesús. "¿Por qué no es una tragedia la *Roma abrasada* de Lope de Vega?" *Philologia hispalensis* 4.1 (1989): 191-206.

Rodríguez de la Flor Adánez, F. *La península metafísica. Arte literatura y pensamiento en la España de la Contrarreforma*. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 1999.

Rojas, Fernando de. *La Celestina* (1499). Eds. Juan Carlos Conde and Marta Haro Cortés. Madrid: Castalia, 2002.

Rozas, Juan Manuel. "Las batuecas de duque de Alba." *Estudios sobre Lope de Vega*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1990. 309-329.

Ruiz Ramón, Francisco. *América en el teatro clásico español: estudio y textos*. Pamplona: Edicones Universidad de Navarra, 1993.

---. *Celebración y catársis: (leer el teatro español.)* Murcia: U de Murcia, 1998.

---. *Historia del teatro español*. Vol. 1. Madrid: Alianza, 1967.

Ruser, W. "*Roma abrasada*, Ein echtes Jugenddrama; eine Studie zu Lope de Vega." *Revue Hispanique* 72(1928): 325-411.

Ryjik, Veronika. *Lope de Vega y la invención de España: El drama histórico y la formación de la conciencia nacional*. Rochester: Tamesis, 2011.

Saavedra Fajardo, Diego de. *Idea de un príncipe político-cristiano*. Barcelona: Juan de Olivares, 1845.

Sahagún, Fray Bernardino de. *Historia General de las cosas de Nueva España* (c. 1540-1585). Ed. Juan Carlos Temprano. Madrid: Historia 16, 1990.

San Pedro, Diego de. *Cárcel de amor* (1492). *Obras completas*. Ed. Keith Whinnom. Vol. 2. Madrid: Castalia, 1972.

Santo-Tomás, Enrique García. *La creación del Fénix: recepción crítica y formación canónica del teatro de Lope de Vega*. Madrid: Gredos, 2000.

Sanz Hermida, J. "Una vieja barbuda que se dice Celestina": Notas acerca de la primera caracterización de Celestina." *Celestinesca* 18.1 (1994): 17-33.

Seville, Saint Isidore de. *Etimologías*. Madrid: Editorial Católica, Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1982.

Shakespeare, William. *Othello*. Eds. Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen. New York: Modern Library, 2009.

Shannon, Robert M. *Visions of the New World in the Drama of Lope de Vega*. New York: Peter Lang, 1989.

Sicroff, Albert A. *Les controverses des statuts de pureté de sang en Espagne du XV^{e} au XVII^{e} siècle*. Paris: Didier, 1960.

Soufas, Teresa S. "Rhetorical Appropriation: Lope's New World Play and Canonicity." *Hispanic Review* 67.3 (1999): 319-31.

Sprang, Kurt, ed. *El drama histórico: teoría y comentarios*. Pamplona: Eunsa, 1998.

Stern, Charlotte. "Lope de Vega, Propagandist?" *Bulletin of the Comediantes* 34.1 (1982): 1-36.

Stols, Eddie, Werner, Thomas, y Verberckmoes, Johan. *Naturalia, Mirabilia et Monstrosa en los Imperios ibéricos*. Leuven: Leuven UP, 2006.

Tate, Robert B. *Ensayos sobre la historiografía peninsular del siglo XV*. Trad. Jesús Díaz. Madrid: Gredos, 1970.

Taylor, Scott K. *Honor and Violence in Golden Age Spain*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2008.

Ticknor, George. *History of Spanish Literature*. 3 vols. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1849.

Toro, Alfonso de. *De las similitudes y diferencias: Honor y drama en los siglos XVI y XVII en Italia y España*. Madrid: Iberoamericana, 1998.

Usunáriz, Jesús Ma. "El matrimonio y su reforma en el mundo hispánico durante el siglo de oro: La promesa matrimonial." Eds. Ignacio Arellano & Eduardo Godoy. *Temas del Barroco hispánico*. Madrid: Iberoamericana, 2004. 293-312.

Valdecasas, Alfonso García. *El hidalgo y el honor.* Madrid: Revista de Occidente, 1948.

van Beysterveldt, A. A. *Répercussions du souci de la pureté de sang sur la conception de l'honneur dans la 'comedia nueva" espagnole*. Leiden: Brill, 1966.

Vega, Lope de. "El animal de Hungría*." Obras de Lope de Vega Publicadas por la Real Academia Española*. Vol. 3. Madrid: Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos, 1917. 422-460.

---. *Arte nuevo de hacer comedias en este tiempo*. Ed. Enrique García Santo-Tomás. Madrid: Cátedra, 2009.

---. "Las batuecas del duque de Alba." *Obras completas de Lope de Vega*. Vol. 9. Madrid: Turner 1993. 849-938.

---. "Los comendadores de Córdoba." *Obras de Lope de Vega*. Vol.11. Madrid: Real Academia Española, 1896. 259-299.

---. "El gran duque de Moscovia." *Obras completas de Lope de Vega.* Vol. 14. Madrid: Turner, 1993. 201-303.

---. "El laberinto de Creta." *Obras de Lope de Vega*. Vol 6. Madrid: Real Academia Española. 1896. 109-143.

---. "La locura por la honra." *Obras de Lope de Vega*. Vol. 2. Madrid: Real Academia Española, 1986. 625-643.

---. "El nuevo mundo descubierto por Cristóbal Colón*." Obras Completas de Lope de Vega.* Vol. 8. Madrid: Turner, 1993. 921-1012.

---. *El nuevo mundo descubierto por Cristóbal Colón*. Ed. Robert M.Shannon. New York: P. Lang, 2001.

---. *Parte XVII de las comedias de Lope de Vega Carpio*. Madrid: Viuda de Alonso Martín, 1621.

---. "Roma abrasada." *Obras Completas de Lope de Vega*. Vol. 18. Madrid: Turner, 1993. 205-304.

---. "Ursón y Valentín, hijos del rey de Francia." *Obras Completas de Lope de Vega*. Vol. 3. Madrid: Turner, 1993. 177-270.

Vega Ramos, María José. "Las indias interiores: Lope y la invención de *Las Batuecas del Duque de Alba*." *Anuario de Lope de Vega* 2 (1996): 171-196.

Vélez-Quiñones, Harry. *Monstrous Displays: Representation and Perversion in Spanish Literature*. New Orleans: UP of the South, 1999.

---. "Monstrous Friendship: The Dynamics of Homosocial Desire in Lope de Vega's El amigo hasta la muerte." *Journal of Interdisciplinary Literature Studies* 7.1 (1995): 45-56.

Vernet, J. "Las Fuentes de *El Gran Duque*." *Cuadernos de Literatura* 5-6 (1949): 17-36.

Virgil. *The Aeneid*. Trans. Robert Fitzgerald. London: Harvill, 1993.

Vitoria, Francisco de. "On the Evangelization of the Unbelievers." *Vitoria: Political Writings*. Ed. Anthony Pagden and Jeremy Lawrance. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. 339-351.

Vives, Juan Luis. *La instrucción de la mujer cristiana*. Ed. Elizabeth Teresa Howe. Madrid: Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca, 1995.

Vossler, Karl. *Lope de Vega und sein Zeitalter*. Muenchen: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchandlung, 1932.

Wardropper, Bruce W. "Honor in the Sacremental Plays of Valdivielso and Lope de Vega." *Modern Language Notes* 66.2 (1951): 81-88.

Weiner, Jack. "Un episodio de la historia rusa visto por autores españoles del Siglo de Oro: El pretendiente Demetrio." *Journal of Hispanic Philology* 2 (1978): 175-201.

---. "La guerra y la paz espirituales en tres comedias de Lope de Vega." *Revista de Estudios Hispánicos* 17.1 (1983): 65-79.

Weisner-Hanks, *Christianity and Sexuality in the Early Modern World*: *Regulating Desire, Reforming Practice*. New York: Routledge, 2010.

Williams, Daniel. *Deformed discourse. The function of the monster in medieval thought and literature*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP**,** 1996.

Wilson, Dudley. *Signs and portents. Monstrous birth from the Middle Ages to the Enlightenment.*

New York: Routedge, 1993.

Wittkower, Rudolf. “Marvels of the East: A Study in the History of Monsters.” *Allegory and the Migration of Symbols*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1977. 45-74.

Young, Richard A. *La figura del rey y la institución real en la comedia lopesca*. Madrid: Ediciones José Porrúa Turanzas, 1979.